LIBRARY

Pacific Theological Seminary.

No. 284

Presented by James White.

BACON & COMPANY, PRINTERS.

THE

HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM.

LECTURES

ON THE

MIXTURE OF CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL POWER

IN THE

GOVERNMENTS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

IN ILLUSTRATION OF THE NATURE AND PROGRESS OF DESPOTISM IN THE ROMISH CHURCH.

BY

REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY SAXTON & MILES,
205 Broadway.
BOSTON: SAXTON, PEIRCE & CO.

1844.

BX
1916
C433
1844
WD
CAN 5

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by
SAXTON & MILES.
in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the Southern Distsict of New York.

S. W. BENEDICT & CO., PRINT.,
128 Fulton Street.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following argument has been suggested and called forth by an ingenious lecture of Bishop Hughes on the Mixture of Civil and Ecclesiastical Power in the Governments of the Middle Ages. Under this plausible and captivating title the reader finds a bold, unflinching apology for the Papacy, with the startling proposition that it is to the Despotism of the Papacy in the middle ages that we owe the preservation of Christianity, and the possession of all our civil freedom. I do not give the words, but the amount of his assertions. The lecture was exceedingly able in point of style and scholarship, and mingled with very plausible admissions as to the errors of the Papacy; which circumstances render it so much the more important to put the affirmations of the Lecturer in their true light, and especially to show that the Romish Church, instead of disavowing the union of Church and State, constitutes in herself the very essence of such union. Her HEART in Italy *is* such a union; the Pope's temporal sovereignty constitutes the left ventricle, his spiritual supremacy the right; and through these two systems pours the life-blood of the Romish Church to the world's extremities.

It is equally necessary to set in their proper light the astounding positions of Bishop Hughes as to the affirmed Republicanism

of Popery, and to show that in all ages the Romish Church has been the enemy both of civil and religious liberty. Whether Bishop Hughes expected to be believed in his singular assertions by any but the members of his own communion we know not; but ours is not the country, nor this the age, when such positions can be assumed for a moment without question. They are so startlingly and sweepingly opposed to all historic truth, that as hearers of Bishop Hughes' lecture, we really felt tempted to question whether he was not playing the satirist with the assumed ignorance and credulity of his audience; whether he was not trying the experiment how far he might enjoy a practical joke on the capacity of their faith in the assertions of the Priesthood. As the very first step in his lecture, he asserted that it was not the genius of the Romish Church to conceal anything of her doctrines or her history! The late freaks enacted with the school-books in this city afford an admirable commentary on this declaration.

The reader will see that the course we have taken in these lectures on such a subject as that announced by Bishop Hughes, is very different from that which we should have pursued had we taken up that subject on its civil rather than its ecclesiastical side. Bishop Hughes having taken his stand-point in the Papacy, we were compelled to take ours there also, and to show that the Papacy, as the example, by eminence, of the Mixture of Civil and Ecclesiastical Power in the Governments of the Middle Ages, was the most perfect and terrific DESPOTISM the world ever saw.

We are indebted to the Rev. CHARLES HALL, of this city, for the appropriate Stanzas on the 64th page, entitled "THE PILGRIMS' LEGACY," which were sung at the close of the First Lecture.

HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM.

FIRST LECTURE.

NATURE OF THE ARGUMENT.

In all speculations on Ecclesiastical History there is no way to criticise correctly, but by placing ourselves first in the light of Christianity at its beginning. We cannot begin with the Fathers, but in the New Testament, in order to a proper judgment of any portion of the history of the Church that has passed since. It is like tracing a mountain torrent from its source in a living rock. You may stand at that source, and follow the stream a little while in its purity. Mark now the rills, as you pass along, that run into it. At first they are small, and much like the original fountain in their clearness. Sometimes there seems to be a silver cascade coming out of the heavens; such seemed at first the fond veneration of the martyrs, and afterwards the cherished remembrance of the Virgin Mary, both of these things to become a torrent of dark idolatry. As you come down from the air of the mountain into the

level world, there are muddy and brawling brooks that pour like rivers into your original stream. Sometimes it spreads out into a wide lake or marsh. Now if, when you put yourself back at any point after these intermixtures have become the body of the stream, you shut yourself up to that scenery, if you judge with the judgment of the inhabitants along its banks, it will seem to you a useful stream, a fertilizing body of water, perfectly suited to the times. But this is not your proper judgment as a Christian. This water where you stand, after all these worldly intermixtures, is not Christianity, but the body of its corruptions. Follow it still onward, and sometimes it flows like the river of Lethe through hell. It leads you where, as in a southern swamp, the trees grow in dripping festoons of impurity, where it is dark at noonday, where below you, the black backs of alligators look like the trunks of trees, for you to step upon, and in the branches above you unclean bats and birds of darkness croak and flap their wings to terrify you. Such was the Papacy, the Romish Church, for hundreds of years, with almost all the institutions that grew out of it; the sanctified, consecrated slough and swamp of the world's impurities.

Sometimes this same river, now become a river of death, runs through deep, dark, vast, magnificent caverns; where, when you carry your torches, the roofs are pendent with blazing stalactites, and the walls seem to sparkle with living diamonds. Here, as in a Gothic Cathedral in the dark ages, if you stop and celebrate the MASS with the inhabitants, you will think it the most gorgeous imposing ceremony in the world;

you may perhaps speculate on the excellence of that system, which, in a period of such ignorance, could throw so sacred a spell over the mind of the world's congregated multitudes. If you please to forget the calm clear sunlight of your primitive Christianity, you may perhaps say, How holy and how awful is the gloom of religious solemnity diffused over the spirit by this darkness, relieved so sacredly by the blaze of wax tapers and jewelled altars! How great a blessing was the Romish Church at this period to the world! But if you remember the simplicity and noonday clearness of the New Testament faith, you will feel that had it not been for that Romish Church, and its consecration and concentration of the corruptions of Christianity for ages into one system of combined superstition and despotism, the world during those dark ages would have been in the clear sunlight of the gospel, instead of worshipping by torch-light amidst the caverns and petrifactions of Popery.

We have a vast subject before us, and I am sure I can trust the candor and intelligence of my audience for a patient investigation of it. I shall begin at the beginning, as certainly you would all wish me to do, and if in tracing the progress of a great despotic universal Hierarchy, such as the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power must always constitute, from its first threadlike roots in the primitive Church of Christ to its mighty trunk and its overshadowing foliage, I should seem to cut athwart sectarian prejudices, I pray you to believe that it is with a charitable spirit and in the pursuit of truth. In cutting our way to a conclusion we are sometimes unconscious whose brush-wood

our blows strike; let us but clear the path, and then settle with the owners of the land afterwards. Nothing that I say shall be set down in prejudice or bitterness. I am turning the leaves of history, and in directing your attention to the features of the Romish Church as there delineated, and reasoning from what it has been in all past ages, and under almost all forms of government, to what, unless the spirit of God descend upon it, it is likely to be still in this age and under our form of government, I have not a particle of other than affectionate and friendly feeling towards all the Romanists in this country, wishing them all well, wishing them the highest blessings they can enjoy in this world, even the uninterrupted enjoyment of all our civil and religious privileges, and the greatest gift God can bestow upon them in the next world, even life eternal through his dear Son. May God thus bless them all, and enlighten them and us alike with the precious light and liberty of the gospel. We go for truth and freedom, wherever we can find it, and against the spirit of oppression wherever we find that.

I was greatly interested, not many evenings ago, in hearing Bishop Hughes' ingenious lecture on the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the governments of the middle ages. I admired his ingenuity, his talent, his scholarship, his gentlemanly bearing; but as I came to conclusions directly the reverse of his, I determined to take some early opportunity to develope them, and to show the grounds of a deep conviction that to trace the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the middle ages would be, in point of fact, to trace the progress of despotism in the Romish Church.

POINTS OF SOPHISTRY TO BE NOTED.

But before entering on this investigation, I must notice two points of sophistry. It is a very common piece of sophistry to predicate of the Romish Church that which belongs to Christianity apart from the Romish Church, and even that period of Ecclesiastical History, which passed before the Romish Papal Church had an existence. The three first centuries of Christianity do not belong to the history of the Papacy, although even then the seeds were sowing of those dreadful corruptions and disorders, which afterwards grew in such a deadly harvest all over the world. We can trace back the roots of the Romish Papal Church into the three first centuries of Christianity; but it is because we find in those centuries the beginnings of the corruptions of Christianity.

It is another piece of sophistry similar to this, and a very dangerous one, to make the Church and Christianity one and the same; for when this is done, ten to one almost all the real Christianity in the world is out of the Church in the form of proscribed dissent and heresy, so that the Church has nothing but the mould, emptied of the spirit, and true Christianity is apart in desert places. It has often been so in this world's history.

A Church therefore may be the Catholic Church, and yet not the Christian Church; that is, she may be the reigning universal Church, the Church Catholic, embracing vast multitudes of members in opposition to the Church Elect, embracing only the comparatively

few, that have the spirit and the truth of Christ. And I say, in proportion as this tenet prevails, namely, that the Church and Christianity are one and the same, true religion declines, Christianity becomes first a nominal profession, then a cloak of covetousness and ambition, then an open sink of corruption and sin. Moreover, the god of this world knows well when Christianity hath departed, or is departing, from the Church. He sees it, when men do not. The priests may keep up their watch-fires to deceive the people and keep the world in awe, and make men think the camp is full of soldiers; but the adversary of mankind knows when the hosts are stealing out, and no creeds or formulas or watch-fires can deceive him. And when Christianity is departing from the Church, then, so far as in him lies, he assists the Church in rising to grandeur and power; for then and thus the Church itself becomes his greatest instrument of human ruin. The best things, both in earth and heaven, become the worst, when perverted and depraved; if the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness; an angel fallen becomes a demon, not a man; and so a Christianity corrupted becomes the most dreadful agent and element of hell.

THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

In tracing the progress of despotism in the Church it is necessary to go back to its first constitution in the New Testament. The chief officers of the Church of Christ in its infancy are included under these three

names, *επισκοποι*, *πρεσβυτεροι*, *διακονοι*, bishops or overseers, presbyters or elders, and deacons or attendants. The terms *επισκοποι* and *πρεσβυτεροι* are used in the New Testament promiscuously and synonymously, as is everywhere admitted. Turn to the 20th chapter of Acts, and you find that Paul sent to Ephesus from Miletus, and called the Elders of the Church, *τους πρεσβυτερους της εκκλησιας*. When convened, he spoke thus to them: Take heed therefore to yourself, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, *επισκοπους*, elsewhere in our translation, bishops, but signifying literally overseers. The same persons, then, are here denominated presbyters (or elders) and bishops. So in the Epistle to Titus, first chapter: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city. If any be blameless, &c. For a bishop must be blameless." Here again it is clear that the two terms are synonymous. So in the first Epistle of Peter: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof," *επισκοπουντες*, acting the *επισκοπος*, fulfilling the office of a bishop, a presbyter. The term *επισκοπος*, overseer, bishop, doubtless came from the nature of the office, and the term *πρεσβυτερος* may at first have arisen from the choice of the older persons to the office, adopted, however, from the Jewish custom of so designating the members of the Sanhedrim, and of the city councils. Not a solitary passage is to be found in the New Testament intimating that these two words ever stood for different offices. In accordance with this,

Paul in writing to the Church at Philippi addresses himself thus: To all the saints at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons. About sixty years after this we are able to compare an epistle by Polycarp to the same congregation at Philippi, in which he mentions only two orders, the presbyters and the deacons. Again, we are told of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas, that when journeying together, they ordained elders in every Church. With all this corresponds the declaration of Jerome: *Apostolus perspicue docet eosdem esse Presbyteros quos Episcopos;* the Apostle clearly teaches that presbyters and bishops are the same. Jerome goes on to state that afterwards, as a matter of expediency, there was one chosen among the presbyters in each church who should preside over the others. He was at first denominated in the Apocalypse the angel, but afterwards the bishop.

In the first and second centuries a bishop had charge of a single church, and was its minister. The most ancient uninspired Christian writing, the Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, written about the beginning of the second century (supposed to be the same Clement whom Paul calls his fellow-laborer), declares that "the Apostles, having preached the gospel in countries and towns, constituted the first fruits of their ministry, whom they approved by the Spirit, bishops and deacons of those who should believe." This Epistle is styled the Epistle of the Church of God at Rome to the Church of God at Corinth. An Episcopal historian (Waddington) observes concerning this Epistle from the Church at Rome to the Church in Corinth, that it is clear that the Episcopal form of

government was not yet here established, *probably as being adverse to the republican spirit of Greece.*

This is a singular concession, and if the reason alleged were true, it would show how remarkably the republican spirit and the spirit of the New Testament coincide. But it would have been a singular reason to give for the non-establishment of the Episcopal form of government, if that government had been *jure divino.* For the Church of Corinth to say to Paul, We will not have the Episcopal government because of the staunch republican spirit of our country, would have been almost the counterpart of King James's maxim—no bishop, no king. King James reasoned that the Episcopal and Monarchical forms of government must stand or fall together; and this Corinthian Church are supposed to have reasoned that if they received the Episcopal form of government it would be adverse to their republican spirit. In truth, the reason why the Episcopal form was not there established was because it was nowhere established, and has been nowhere revealed from heaven. The Corinthian Church was not different in its form of government from any other Churches.

The Churches thus constituted with their ministers, were independent of each other, and elected their own bishops, presbyters, or pastors. It was the simplest form of Church government, and the most coincident with the commands and warnings of our blessed Lord: Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they who are great exercise authority upon them; BUT IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG

you. All ye are brethren. Call no man Master on earth, for one is your Master even Christ.

"In this century and the next" (says a historian who has always from all parties received the praise of accuracy and impartiality, Dr. Mosheim), "a bishop had charge of a single Church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its lord, but was in reality its minister or servant; he instructed the people, conducted all parts of public worship, and attended on the sick and necessitous in person; and what he was unable thus to perform, he committed to the care of the presbyters; but without power to ordain or determine anything, except with the concurrence of the presbyters and the brotherhood. The emoluments of this singularly laborious and perilous office were very small. For the Churches had no revenues, except the voluntary contributions of the people, or the oblations; which, moderate as they doubtless were, were divided among the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons, and the poor of the church." Such was the primitive arrangement, so simple, so utterly removed from all pride and domination, a kingdom indeed not of this world. The church was an assembly of believers under Christ their head, choosing their own ministers.

RISE OF DIOCESAN EPISCOPACY.

But this did not last. In process of time, the bishops in the cities, by their own labors and those of the presbyters, gathered other churches in the neighboring regions, and the pastors of those churches came to be considered in a measure inferior to the city bishops,

who took the superintendence of them, and so, gradually became overseers of provinces, which were denominated *dioceses*. From being pastors of single churches, they became superintendents of many pastors. There was also a distinction made between country bishops and city bishops; and by-and-by, when ambition grew, and the desire to have a great diocese, and to advance and increase the dignity of bishop, it was proposed to suppress the order of country bishops, and to ordain no more bishops in villages and little towns, lest the episcopal name and authority should be brought into contempt. Thus grew a disparity in the clergy, the first step of evil in the Christian Church; thus was the door opened to the entrance of pride, ambition, worldliness, the amassing of wealth, the accumulation of grandeur. Thus grew up diocesan episcopacy, which, by the end of the third century was preparing to become a great hierarchy of many gradations and titles each rising above the other, and each the object of ambition in proportion to its wealth and dignity. In the councils of the churches by representatives, which began to be held about the middle of the second century, there being a necessity for a president among the confederated bishops, the title and prerogatives of metropolitan grew up. The metropolis of the province would naturally be the place of meeting, and the bishop of the metropolis came naturally to be appointed as president, and at length to be regarded as such of course, and to be denominated the metropolitan. The claims first set up by bishops above presbyters were then made by metropolitans over bishops, and then by patriarchs over metropolitans, and

then by the Pope over the whole world. A corrupt state of the clergy followed upon the institution of all this hierarchical grandeur, and kept pace with it in arrogance, voluptuousness, and contentions for pre-eminence of rank and glory. Bishops adopted the state and grandeur of princes, particularly the bishops who had under them the more numerous and wealthy congregations; they sat on thrones surrounded by their ministers, and were clad in dazzling garments. The presbyters imitated the bishops, and the deacons imitated the presbyters, and then came a host of minor officers, sub-deacons, acolythes, readers, door-keepers, exorcists, and others. The people were at length excluded from all voice in ecclesiastical affairs, and the bishops appropriated the ecclesiastical property to themselves, or distributed it as they pleased.

From the time of Constantine, the wealth, honors, and privileges of the clergy in this vast hierarchy, first more accurately modelled and by law incorporated by him, received an immense increase. The bishops maintained disgraceful contests respecting the boundaries of their sees, and the extent of their jurisdiction; they trampled on the rights of the people and the inferior clergy, and vied with the civil governors of provinces in luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness. Thus was reared an enormous fabric of Church grandeur and dominion; and soon the very idea of the church as Christ instituted it, came to be forgotten. The church signified merely the church dignitaries; people were not considered as a part of it, except as so much material to be used and governed. Power was considered inherent in particular offices, and the

custom of election, with its privileges, was entirely taken away from the people.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL JUDICATORY.

The episcopal authority became absolute. It is a deeply interesting matter to trace it from its beginnings. I might refer you to many authors, as the learned Peter Jurieu, Geisler, Mosheim and others, but on this point I shall more directly take the assistance of Campbell, as beyond all question the most vigorous and accurate ecclesiastical anatomist. Among the early Christian societies there had grown up very naturally, from an unwillingness to go to law before unbelievers, the custom of nominating their pastors as judges or arbitrators in their questions of civil right and wrong. At length this trust of arbitration came to be considered by the pastors as their right. Especially was it so asserted when the churches grew in wealth, and the bishops in a worldly sense did so magnify their offices. Then, when the Roman emperors became Christian, they were ready to confirm by law whatever prerogatives were supposed to belong to Christ's ministers. So the bishop's power of judging was, under Constantine, ratified by the law; the magistrate was bound to execute his decision; and in any cause before a secular power, if an appeal were made by either party to the court of the bishop, it was to be carried thither, and from that tribunal there could be no appeal. This was in effect "throwing the whole judiciary power of the state into the hands of the

clergy. All the ordinary judicatories were now reduced to act solely in subordination to the spiritual courts, which could overrule the proceedings of the secular, whilst their own was not liable to be overruled by any." The effect of such power was injurious in the highest degree to the interests of religion. The dignitaries of the Church, having such vast authority, were flattered, caressed, bribed, courted by inferiors and dependents. The prelates, being armed with the terror of the magistrate, religion ceased to be the power of love, and men's consciences were trampled on. The prelates had their appendages judicatorial, their chancellors, commissaries, officials, advocates, proctors, registrars, apparitors, etc.; and bailiffs, tipstaves, fines, imprisonments, distraining of goods, coercive power in every shape, as Campbell with vigorous satire has remarked, came to be the order of the day instead of that beautiful simplicity of Paul, Now, I Paul, myself, beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. The jurisdiction of the bishops was greatly enlarged by successive emperors; the principal bishops were chosen by the prince for his councillors, a distinction which added immense authority to the Episcopal tribunal. At length they assumed the absolute and exclusive right to all criminal and civil jurisdiction over the clergy, and in various cases even over the laity, in ecclesiastical causes. In mixed causes they insisted that the bishop should be judge as well as the magistrate. They had a rule also that every cause should devolve on the ecclesiastical tribunal, if the magistrate either refused or neglected to do justice. And finally, they asserted that this power of judgment

in the bishop was a divine right, annexed by Christ to the essence of prelatical dominion, as one of its prerogatives. "Thus, in the course of ages, upon the spiritual power given by Christ to the Church of binding and loosing, that is, of excluding from, and receiving back into their communion, and upon the institution of Paul for terminating amicably their differences in matters of property by reference (to believers), without recurring to the tribunal of infidels, there had been erected, by several degrees, a spiritual-temporal tribunal, the most wonderful the world ever saw." Afterwards, in the more complete development of the Romish hierarchy, the Popes claimed to be of divine right the fountain and depositaries of all secular as well as spiritual jurisdiction; and one argument on which they founded this claim was this passage: They said, Lord, here are two swords. And he said, It is enough; denoting that there were two sorts of power deposited by the Saviour with the Church, the temporal and the spiritual, and that these two were sufficient for all her occasions, and that these two were entrusted to the Pope because they were entrusted to Peter, and that they were entrusted to Peter because he cut off the right ear of Malchus with one of them, and he must have had both! How dark must have been the state of the world when such an argument could dare to be palmed upon it!

But what can be said when I tell you that not to ignorance and superstition was this argument confined, but that St. Bernard himself, an angel of light, in comparison with the darkness of the Papacy, and yet, with all his learning, the most unflinching of the Papal

champions, condescended to employ the same argument! The spiritual and material swords, said he, belong to the Church; and if it did not belong to the Pope to use them, or to his nod to have them drawn, the Lord, when two swords were offered to him, would not have said *it is enough*, but, *it is too much!* Astonishing mixture of piety and pride, of religion and learning, with the demon of spiritual aggrandizement!

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

In the progress of the Hierarchy to its perfection, the principal cities of the Roman Empire, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, came to be dignified with the title of Patriarch. The jealousy between these cities came at length to a contest of rivalry between the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople. But in the year 533 the Emperor Justinian declared the Bishop of Rome to be chief of the whole Ecclesiastical body of the Empire. In the letter of the Emperor to the Romish Bishop thus constituted Pope, he speaks of his desire to preserve the unity of the Apostolic Chair, and says, "For we cannot suffer that anything which relates to the state of the Church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved, without the knowledge of your Holiness, who are the Head of the Holy Churches, for in all things, as we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honor and authority of your Apostolic Chair." The plea of supreme authority derived directly from Peter had meanwhile been gaining ground. It seems to

have been first advanced about the beginning of the fifth century by Innocent, and in the course of a century it grew to be the grand argument for the Pope's supremacy, so that in the time of Pope Gelasius it was solemnly asserted in a pontifical council, and the claim rapidly grew on by degrees, assisted by Imperial edicts, of a divine title, primacy, superintendency, supremacy, universal and divine power. In the reign of the Emperor Mauritius, the Patriarch of Constantinople assumed the title of Universal Bishop. This assumption incensed beyond all measure the reigning Patriarch of Rome, Gregory I. It is one of the most remarkable things in all history that this Pontiff declared and strenuously maintained that "whosoever assumed that heretical, blasphemous, and infernal title, was the follower of Lucifer, the forerunner and herald of Anti-Christ, in that it neither did nor could belong to any bishop whatever."

The Emperor Mauritius could not be persuaded by all Gregory's arguments to enter into his views. Just at this time Mauritius was murdered and dethroned by an execrably vicious centurion named Phocas, who reigned in his stead. To this horrible villain Pope Gregory wrote with great applause and flattery, in a tumult of joy because Mauritius, whom he regarded as his enemy, had been put to death. He applauded Phocas and his dreadful crime, in order that he might gain his favor against the Patriarch of Constantinople. Gregory soon died; but Boniface III., who succeeded him, obtained of this Emperor Phocas the revocation of the title of Universal Bishop, and the perpetual annexation of it to himself and to the Ro-

man See, the Pontiff being vested with the primacy of all the bishops of the empire. The Church of Rome, in accepting this new dignity and title, fulfilled the prophecy of Gregory, who had denounced it, and stamped upon herself, according to his opinion, the characteristics of vain-glorious, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, anti-Christian, heretical, diabolical, for with all these epithets did Gregory brand the pontiff who should assume the title of Universal Bishop. Universal Bishop and Vicar of Jesus Christ! This, with its concomitants, was the climax and consummation of anti-Christian pride in the Romish Hierarchy, and from this event commences the rapid growth of the Papacy as the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition. This was at the very commencement of the seventh century, in the year 606. Here, then, we pause for the present.

CORRESPONDING CORRUPTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Now I wish you to remember that in our sketch thus far I have confined myself to the progress of the Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy* raised gradually from the primitive Church, and at length, by the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, consummated as the Romish Hierarchy, and destined to rule, as an ecclesiastical despotism, for many long dark centuries over the world. It is not to be supposed that such a fabric could be reared in the *government* of the Church, without corresponding enormity of corruption in the doctrines, ceremonies, and practices of the Church. Accordingly, in these first six centuries of Christianity, the greatest

abuses, so prevalent in after ages, had appeared, and the seeds of others were sown, the seeds of almost all possible evils indeed, in the utter corruption of the clergy. Leo the Great became the Roman Pontiff in the year 440. Under his authority and influence the Confessional was established, and in it the conscience of the people was delivered over to the power of the Priest, and an enormous addition was made to the power and influence of the clergy. In his time and in that of Gregory, that is, in the period between 400 and 600, the veneration for martyrs and relics had increased almost to an established worship, and images were introduced into the churches. The institutions of Monachism, that great centre and support of the wickedness of the Romish court, and power of the Romish Church for ages, had struck deep. The practices of Polytheism itself had been adopted by the Church in order to allure the Pagans and barbarians in greater crowds into her bosom. The feast days of Paganism became the saints' days of Christianity; the images of the martyrs supplied the absence of the statues of the gods; the gorgeous dresses and ceremonies of the priests, the frankincense and the altars, the pictures and shrines of this new mythology, it was rightly concluded by the Romish clergy, would prove to the barbarians and idolaters a rich compensation for the renunciation of that grosser and less gorgeous polytheism to which their senses had been accustomed. Moreover, the sacrament of baptism was supposed to contain a full and absolute expiation of sin, and the assurance of eternal salvation; hence there were many proselytes, who, though they renounced their idolatry, de-

ferred their baptism, to continue the indulgence of their sins, which, by the application of that rite at any time before death, they could so easily wash away. There can be little doubt that this was one great reason with Constantine himself for deferring his own baptism. "The salvation of the people was purchased at an easy rate," says Gibbon, and the sneer is just, "if it be true that in one year 12,000 men were baptized in Rome, besides women and children; and that a white garment, with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor to every convert."

It was this religion that the celebrated Pope Gregory, in the sixth century, sent to Britain, ordering that for the accommodation and allurement of the Pagans, and to make Christianity sit easy upon them, the days on which they had been accustomed to sacrifice to the gods should be appointed as festivals of the Saints, and so the populace be allowed to bring and kill their victims, and perform their sacrifices as usual. The resolute pontiff was determined that thus Satan should be cheated, and the souls of the multitude saved! It was this religion of which a Pagan writer remarked (Eunapius, quoted in Gibbon), with a sarcasm and unbelief not at all to be wondered at, that "instead of deities, the heads salted and pickled, of infamous malefactors, are the gods which the earth produces in our days; the martyrs, the supreme arbitrators of our prayers and petitions to the deity, whose tombs are now consecrated as the objects of the veneration of the people."

I have spoken of the ambition of the clergy, as a necessary result growing out of the aggrandizement

and variety of their offices and titles. We will take two instances of this for illustration, both of them occurring in the See of Rome, but both before that See had received the title and supremacy of universal Bishop. The first, not long after the conversion of Constantine, and the alliance of religion with the State, was the horrible conflict between two of the clergy, Damasus and Ursinus, nominated and elected by opposite partisans to fill the Episcopal chair of Rome, about the year 366. The most dreadful violence, fightings, burning of buildings and bloodshed, took place; a hundred and thirty-seven persons were massacred in the church of Liberius, and the prefect of the city was compelled to take refuge in the suburbs. A pagan and contemporary writer has left on record his feelings and thoughts in the observance of this warfare.

The second instance is in the year 498, a still more terrible and continued conflict between Lymmachus, a deacon, and Laurentius, an arch presbyter, with their respective multitudes of partisans, for the succession to the same dignity of the Pontiff of the See of Rome. The city was kept in an uproar for months; there were uncontrollable mobs, battles and bloodshed, in the streets and public places; both the pontiffs were accused of the most dreadful crimes, and three separate councils assembled at Rome were unable to terminate the fierce contest. Now we beg you to look at the picture which such scenes give, the revelation which they lay open, of the nature of the prevalent Christianity of the times. Suppose for a moment that such a conflict should take place in the city of New York

between two of the clergy chosen to fill a vacant bishoprick; what conclusion would you be justified in drawing as to the degree of piety in the Church and community?

DIVISIONS OF THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT.

During the period which we have now swept with our historical perspective, several great sources of corruption and wickedness, several great elements of tyranny and cruelty, several great engines of ambition and misery to the world, were developed and set in motion, to be perfected afterwards, and to sweep the earth as with an infernal whirlwind, for at least ten centuries. They constitute such links in the chain of despotism engirding the world, that they must be dwelt upon consecutively in our argument, and we shall bring all these trains of investigation to bear upon our argument as to the nature and consequence of the mingling of civil and ecclesiastical power, and as to the nature of the Romish despotism as the consummation of such a mixture.

First, the idea was fixed in men's minds of the earthly visible unity and aggrandizement of the Church as a kingdom of this world. Second, the maxim was established that to lie and deceive becomes a virtue, if religion or the Church can be profited by it. Third, the alliance followed between the civil and ecclesiastical hierarchies, the union of Church and State. Fourth, there followed upon this the employment of civil penalties for the compulsion of the

conscience in religious things. Fifth, there was commenced the opposition of the Church to the diffusion of knowledge and learning. Sixth, the ministry of the Church became a sacrificial priesthood, and the idea was established to the utter annihilation of the great principle of Justification by Faith, that pardon of sin could be purchased by money, penance, human merit, through the medium of the priest. Seventh, the foundations of the Canon law were laid, the body, power, and authority of which continued to increase as a main support of the Papacy, even up to the sixteenth century. It will be found of essential importance to trace every one of these abuses, in disclosing fully the nature of the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the governments of the middle ages, and the means by which the system, formed of such a mixture, was supported. We bring up these great facts from the past gulf of history, not, be it remembered, for the facts' sake, or for the sake of dwelling upon them, or of elucidating the corruptions of any particular Church, but solely for the sake of great principles to be established out of such a survey. We can get at such principles only by such a survey, only by going thoroughly into past events, in order to understand the lessons, for the sake of which God permitted the events to be developed. In this survey, as we pass along, the false positions contained in Bishop Hughes's lecture will be made manifest.

IDEA OF THE VISIBLE UNITY AND AGGRANDIZEMENT OF THE CHURCH.

I. Our first point, then, is this, namely: the idea settled and fixed in the minds of men, of the earthly, visible unity and aggrandizement of the Church as a kingdom of this world. We must trace this idea and its consequences somewhat at large.

As early as the second century we find the germ of the idea, fully developed in the third century, of a visible Catholic Church, beyond the pale of which there could be no salvation. In the apostolic times it was not said, Except you join the Church you cannot enter heaven, but, Except ye repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, you cannot enter heaven. But so soon as men began to attach importance to the idea of a visible Church, within which alone there was salvation, then an entrance into the Church came to be considered as the cause, instead of the consequence, of a personal union to Christ. "He cannot have God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother," said Cyprian; an absolute falsehood, when grounded on the idea of a visible Church, as alone containing salvation. Upon this idea of the visible Catholic Church was next grafted the idea of a perfect uniformity in the creed and observances of that Church. As early as the second century the Bishop of Rome condemned the Asiatic Bishops, because they refused to conform to the western Churches in the celebration of Easter. By and by, when the Church was established by law, conformity came to be considered essential to

its unity, and non-conformity was branded as a crime. This was natural. If there be one visible Church, and no possibility of salvation out of it, the visibility of that Church must consist in its uniformity; every species of dissent from its rules or confessions is regarded as a schism, to be punished as a crime. Hence, with the idea of the visible unity of the Church, comes, of course, the restraint and punishment of heresy, the bondage of freedom, the fettering of individual opinion. The authority of the Church becomes supreme, in matters both of faith and practice; and these matters being settled by councils, which councils were councils of the Bishops, the way was gradually prepared for restricting the idea of the Church to the idea of the hierarchy, the assembly of its officers. "It was not until the habit of acting in bodies," says an Episcopal historian, before quoted, "made them sensible of their common interest and real power, that they ventured to assert such claims, and assumed a loftier manner in the government of their dioceses; so that, though these synods were doubtless indispensable to the well-being of Christianity, they seem to have been the means of corrupting the original humility of its ministers; and the method which was intended to promote only the eternal interests of the Church, promoted in some degree the worldly consideration of the order which governed it. This change began to show itself toward the end of the second century, and it is certain that at this period we find the first complaints of the incipient corruptions of the clergy." Those corruptions grew precisely with the growth of the idea and the power of the Church as a hierarchy.

It is impossible to say precisely what time the idea

of the Church was first restricted to the clergy. When it was, then ambition became the ruling passion of the Church. This restriction you may find in modern times, and in the minds of some great writers. Guizot's idea of the Church and his manner of using the word may be learned from one almost casual sentence. In speaking of the retirement of religious orders into monasteries, he says, these institutions became, during this barbarous period, *an asylum for the Church, as the Church was for the laity.* It would seem thus that his idea of the Church is confined to the priesthood; the people form no part of it. But what is the Church of Christ? Is it not the assembly of the souls of his flock? Where two or three are met in my name, there am I; there is Christ, the Great Shepherd and Bishop of his flock. There is the Church of Christ, where Christ and his people are, not where the clergy alone are. The truth is, the Church is essential to the being of the clergy, and not the clergy to the being of the Church. The clergy come out of the Church, and not the Church out of the clergy; and so they are a divine order; the Church being from God, by a new creation of his Spirit, they, as a part of the Church, are, according to God's will, through the Church and for the Church, a divine order. But if they boast themselves against the Church, be it remembered, it is the Church that bears them, and not they who bear the Church. They are gifts granted of God for the edification of the body of Christ, *for his body's sake*, which is the Church; but they are not the body of Christ, God forbid, but simple members of that body, appointed by the Holy Ghost as overseers and teachers.

A visible body must have a visible head; and hence the progress of this idea of a visible unity to the climax of the Ecclesiastical hierarchy in a Universal Pontiff was natural and consistent. When this hierarchy was thus completed, it became the greatest enshrinement of the genius of universal ambition that the world ever saw. Ambition was the infecting spirit and sin of the Church so organized. Hence in almost all the councils of the Church you meet bodies of men intriguing, managing, striving, contending, for the aggrandizement of their own order, for the consolidation of Ecclesiastical Empire, not for the good of mankind, not for the spread of the gospel, not for the instruction of the multitude. The despotic unity of the Church, not the glory of Christ, was the object. Even the doctrines of the Church were put into precise dogmas, not to edify the Church, or to instruct mankind, or to render the knowledge of the gospel more accessible, but to render the dominion of the Church more absolute, its unity more despotic. To repress and punish heretics, and not to teach, win, and convert unbelievers, or to build up believers, was the work of Ecclesiastical councils for ages. Men may say, philosophers may say, that such councils, such bodies of men existing through the dark ages, and such a Hierarchy called the Christian Church, were necessary to keep alive Christianity in the world, and that they did keep it alive. We should rather say, they kept it dying than living. Instead of being as the candlestick, they were as the bushel. The light was put under the bed, and the bed, the Church, with the light under it, was made a bed of the embraces of luxury and power.

The true unity of the Church of Christ is oneness of spirit, not of form; it is union to him, to Christ, and the unity which is the consequence of that, not union to a hierarchy or form of Church government, and the unity which is the consequence of that, The Church is put first in the estimation of hierarchists; belong to the Church, they say, and you are united to Christ; the voice of the gospel is very different; belong to Christ, it says, and you are in him united to the true Church. Christ himself says, I am the Vine, not, the Church is the Vine; abide in me, not, abide in the Church, and let my words abide in you, not, let the Church's word abide in you. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, not, if ye abide under one form of government, but, if ye love one another. Unity is a very different thing from uniformity. Uniformity, generally speaking, is compulsion and deadness; unity is life and love. There may be perfect uniformity where there is no unity, as, on the other hand, there may be perfect unity, where there is very little uniformity. The unity of uniformity is not what our blessed Lord ever commanded, but, the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace. Any other unity than this, any unity without it, is a unity of evil, that leads inevitably to ambition, aggrandizement, despotic power, persecution, cruelty. It is a remorseless unity, with the conscience seared as with a hot iron, destructive of all liberty and love. It is a frowning, overawing, overshadowing, overwhelming unity, that, to sustain and carry out its purposes, confounds the eternal distinctions between right and wrong, sanctifies guilt and falsehood, does evil that good may come, and makes its members the fanatics of superstition and

arbitrary power. Anything becomes lawful for the sake of the Church; and its members, when proscribed by this demon of Church pride and despotism, are willing in all things to aggrandize the Church, though it be at the utter sacrifice of all personal independence. Nay, the greater this aggrandizement, at whatever cost of this nature, the greater the pride of the individual, as a member, though trampled on, of the aggrandized, glorious, worshipped order.

Now I say, it is this false terrific unity of form and establishment, compressing and binding men together under it as slaves, instead of Christ's freemen, that is at the bottom of all the evil inflicted by the Church upon the world. This, I hesitate not to say, is the great corruption of Christianity, which for ages made the Church not an incarnation and enshrinement of goodness, but of evil; not an instrument of deliverance and mercy, but of deeper bondage and pain. It is a corruption, the taint whereof exists still; and still men are making baptism the door of regeneration, and the Church the door of heaven. It is a corruption, in which the simplest rites of Christ's institution for his people are made the means of bondage and error to the soul. Give to the priest only those two rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and let him hold them as the keys that unlock the brazen gates of this vast visibility of power and glory, as the only means of admission within the bosom of this tremendous unity, through which only the trembling proselyte can enter heaven, and you have at once corrupted religion, and perverted its very idea in the soul of the worshipper; a perversion absolutely fatal in placing the symbol for the thing signified; and also you have corrupted the

Church from the temple of piety and love, into an engine of oppressive, vast, sweeping, resistless ambition and despotism.

In such a state of things, in such a unity, Christianity and the Church become distinct and separate. Christianity, if it exists, exists apart from the Church, as entirely a foreign essence, nay, even as a heresy. In the greatest perfection of this unity in the Romish Church, when Christianity appeared, then the Church crushed it; when her sweet, mild, holy voice was heard, it sounded like a lunatic's; it was strange, wild, heretical, dangerous; it must be imprisoned. But religion had gone out of this hierarchy from a very early period, and the consequence was the repressing and preventing the world's mercy, and the continuance of the world in darkness for successive ages, in spite of the historical existence of the so-called Christian Church. The salt having lost its savor, consequently, although it was thrown upon the world in this vast and splendid unity, yet the world continued to be, what it always must be without piety, a dunghill; and a corrupted Christianity did but add to its festering, polluted, pestilential ingredients.

CIVILISATION OF THE MIDDLE AGES. THE ROMISH HIERARCHY AN OBSTACLE.

We may judge from this in some measure how scandalous to true piety it is to attribute to Christianity the poor and barbarous civilisation that reigned in the world during a large portion of the dark and middle ages. The civilisation which would have been pro-

duced by true Christianity, had been a very different and a far more glorious and beneficial advancement of the world. But the Romish Church repressed that advancement, so that it may be considered doubtful if the world would not have made just as great progress in mere civilisation, without any Christian Church at all. What Guizot calls the history of civilisation in modern Europe, is, in point of fact, in many respects the history of ambition in modern Europe. It would not be difficult to show this; it would not be difficult to show that ambition in its march, both personal and corporational, carries with it inevitably a train of civilisation, and that the civilisation of modern Europe before the Reformation was not owing so much to the impressible tendency in man towards civilisation, or to the beneficial working of benevolent principles, either in the Church or out of it, as to the working of selfishness. The most despotic monarch tends towards a certain degree of civilisation; for he will strive to make himself, his court, all his own circumstances, as glorious and grand as possible. Hence he will draw from all sources the elements of luxury, of comfort, of splendor, of display, and even of refinement, though it may be barbaric refinement; and in all this there is progress towards general civilisation. Perhaps he will build cities, like Cain the murderer, and name them after the name of his first born son. Perhaps he will build pyramids and rear temples out of the superstition and slavery of the people, which shall be regarded in after ages as the material types of a wonderful period of civilisation. So a despotic church, in seeking the establishment of its own despotic unity, and the aggrandizement of its vast hierarchy, though

the aim in every member of the order may be purely selfish, and neither general civilisation nor general happiness be ever thought of as an end, will yet, in this very selfishness, tend to the civilisation of mankind. You might take Napoleon as an illustration of this principle. There were many good things and grand principles that grew out of his whirlwind course, noble institutions, and enterprises, and sometimes nations set at liberty; but no man would dream of saying that Napoleon's object was the world's happiness, or the world's civilisation, but on the whole remorseless conquest, of which the good ends that he accomplished were rather heavenly accidents than human purposes, God's arrangements and not his own. In the prosecution of his great end, the road across the Simplon was a vast and noble work, a magnificent enterprise, shot through eternal Alps, driven where the world might have waited for centuries before benevolence or mere civilisation would have driven it, through rock galleries sheeted with ice and snow, down which avalanches might innocently thunder into unfathomable depths below; but still the genius of the enterprise was Remorseless Conquest.

And just so with the dominion of the Popes, the march of the Romish hierarchy; there were many good things grew out of it, through God's preventing mercy, to the world; but on the whole its genius was Remorseless Conquest. The good things were heaven's accidents; the evil was its character and its essence. Nor can there be anything more certain than that, during the dark and middle ages, on the whole, the happiness of the many, the elevation of society, the Christianisation of the common people, nay the rights

of the common people, were scarcely thought of; these things entered not into the views of men; and how should they, as long as what was called the Christian Church set the example, and taught the lesson to all mankind, of supreme selfishness; the idea of laboring for the amelioration or the good of mankind was merged and lost in the ideas either of personal or hierarchical aggrandizement. This was what the Church pursued with very few individual exceptions. You may bring forward great and good names in the darkest period; Bernard, Bruno, Anselm, Thomas A'Kempis; but they no more constituted the Roman Church, or any part of its spirit, or any part of its fruits, than Simeon and Anna in the Jewish Temple constituted the spirit or the fruits of the proud, corrupted, persecuting Jewish hierarchy, abandoned of God and given over to destruction. In point of fact, the light of such benevolent minds was like lamps in sepulchres, shining upon dead men's bones and all uncleanness, but powerless to give them existence, or to clear away the pollution, or to make the abodes of death and cruelty the habitations of life and mercy. Such minds were no more the results or the characteristics of the Romish hierarchy, than the magnificent cathedrals of the Gothic architecture were the results or the proofs of general piety and intelligence.

God, it is true, counteracts our selfishness. Our world would be an open, undisguised hell of wickedness, if he did not.

> Heaven doth with us, as we with torches do,
> Not light them for themselves.

Heaven makes even a purely ambitious mind, and a

purely ambitious hierarchy, in spite of itself, minister in many ways to good; but it is Heaven's idea, not ours. So in those ages the idea of Christianity was lost sight of in the idea of a vast Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. The Great Invisible Head of the Church was displaced first by the Church, and then for many ages by its self-constituted earthly Head, the Supreme Pontiff usurping the place of the Heavenly. The object before all men's minds was Power. With the Priests, it was power on earth and in heaven; power on earth by means of power in heaven; power over men's minds, bodies, possessions, by power of their consciences. Gain the conscience, and you gain the world; power supreme on earth followed men's belief in a power to shut out from Heaven. Well did the Priests know this.

> For, give you but a foot of conscience there,
> And you, like Archimedes, toss the globe.

With kings, emperors, and barons, it was power on earth, dominion, authority, the great lust of the fallen archangel, and of fallen man—Power, uncontrolled, unshackled Power. Alfred the Great, our Alfred, was a wonderful exception, but almost solitary. Charlemagne was somewhat an exception; but the character of Charlemagne was far more that of personal ambition than Alfred's; and in the measures of that great mind you see but a larger and more liberal sweep, than smaller minds could accomplish, of the ideas of conquest and consolidated empire. This must draw civilisation with it, but mark you, civilisation in spite of it, civilisation as an accident and not an object.

Just so with the crusades, enlarged upon in some quarters, almost as if it were a benefit conferred upon the world by the Papacy! Singular delusion! Civilisation did indeed grow out of the crusades, but again I say, in spite of the purpose of them; as an accident of Heaven's mercy, and not an object of man's intention; as a result thrown in by that glorious prerogative of God, by which he brings good out of evil, and is ever making the wrath of man to praise Him. So man and hierarchies go on, taking their great strides of ambition, and God in spite of them makes great general good to grow even out of their evil movements. So men mingle the cup of misery for the multitude in the accomplishment of their purposes, but God throws even into the very dregs of the cup the elements of some after result for his own glory and man's good.

The generalizing sophistry of scholars may wear the appearance, and gain the reputation, of originality, in finding out and illustrating the uses of abuses; but they should be careful to distinguish between the essence and aim of an abuse, and the good result which in God's providence may spring out of it. Some men allow themselves to talk of the blessings of the Papacy in such and such directions; how, for example, it restrained the power of kings, and preserved the records of Christianity. But mark you, if it had not risen to that enormous despotism in itself which *could* restrain the power of kings, the pure influences of the gospel would have restrained that power, and regulated it for the people's good, long before; the pure influences of the gospel would have prevented the need of the interposition of the vast machinery of an Ecclesiastical Despotism. And if, instead of keeping the records of

Christianity hidden during the period of the world's ignorance and darkness, and thus preserving them in monastic cobwebs, the papacy, and the monasteries, and the monks had spread them before the people as humble teachers, that ignorance and darkness would have been dissipated. *Preserving* the truths and records of Christianity in a dark age by *hiding* them! It is just as if you should say, having only one solitary lamp lighted in the world, we will, instead of lighting other lamps by it, put it in a vault, and keep it till the night is passed, lest the darkness destroy it. And we will make the world believe that all the light in the world is in our power; and that on penalty of eternal death men must go nowhere else for light but to our dungeons, and thus we will keep the world in subjection. So the Papacy preserved Christianity not *for* the world but *from* the world.

The Church was a vast Hierarchy, a form of power, an incarnation, not of Christianity, but of conquest. But your generalizers will say that civilisation was progressing, and the Church was a means of this progression. Again I will tell you how. Christianity was as a germ, a germ both of civilisation and piety, thrown into the world, deposited in the earth to grow there. As it was growing, the Hierarchical Church was thrown upon it as a mountain, a hierarchy, a great rock of worldly ambition. What becomes of the germ? It cannot die; it lives, it struggles, it shoots this way and that way, it heaves the mountain; at length, through Heaven's mercy, it meets a cleft, and up it rises, forcing itself through the fissure, up to the topmost surface, to the open air; and then and there, with unabated vigor and freshness of life, it spreads

and grows, till the whole surface is covered with rich mould and verdure, and the tree shoots up to heaven. Now a historian or a sophist, who comes and tells me that this mould, and this verdure, and this magnificent tree are the offspring of the Romish Church, may easily be confounded; for with my spade I can show the hard rock, and the cleft through which Christianity, repressed for ages, did at length regain its liberty, and grew and spread, and covered the earth with verdure, in spite of the Romish Hierarchy.

FALSEHOOD OF THE POSITION THAT THE HIERARCHY WAS NECESSARY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

But nevertheless, answers our original scholar, this Hierarchy, this Papacy, this mountain, as you call it, was very useful in shielding that germ of Christianity from the storms and fires that swept over the world during those ages. Just as a Bastile hides, and thus preserves its prisoner. This germ of Christianity was preserved from growth, not from destruction. It is one of the falsest of all positions to suppose, that had not the Christian Church existed as a hierarchy in the fourth and fifth centuries, religion would have been swept from the world. And yet this position is in some measure assumed, even by Guizot, and ecclesiastical historians have not disdained to follow it, and to assert, to the base betrayal of our faith, or rather, to the slander of its inherent divine energy, that under a less vigorous form of human government, religion would have perished from the world. This is, absolutely, making the corruptions of Christianity essential to its existence. "The overweening authority claimed and

exercised by the clergy," says Milman, "their existence as a separate and exclusive caste, at this particular period in the progress of civilisation, became of the highest utility. A religion without a powerful and separate sacerdotal order, even perhaps if that order had not in general been bound to celibacy, and so prevented from degenerating into an hereditary caste, would have been absorbed and lost in the conflict and confusion of the times. Religion, unless invested by general opinion in high authority, and that authority asserted by an active and incorporated class, would scarcely have struggled through this complete disorganisation of all the existing relations of society." Open the New Testament, and place yourself in the blaze of its light, and such speculations as these must be viewed with indignation and contempt. It is then the opinion of Mr. Milman that Christ is incompetent to keep his Church in existence, when barbarians invade the country, unless it be in the form of a hierarchy, supported by human authority and power. I can trace such sentiments to nothing else but the habit of dependence and worldliness, produced in an Established Church by always looking to the State for protection; such a mind is incapable of producing a free and noble Ecclesiastical History, because it never sees the true, independent glory of the Gospel. It supposes that the Church must sink to destruction the moment the State withdraws from its allegiance, and that Christianity must go to ruin, if the State on which it has been accustomed to lean, be overturned.

Just so, an historian of a better spirit of faith in the divine hand, nevertheless is not ashamed to say that Christianity itself would have been swept away from

the surface of the west, had it not been rescued by an established body of ministers with splendid ceremonies. "Thence resulted the gradual conversion of the invaders," says Mr. Waddington, "by the agency of the visible Church. Without those means, had Christianity then existed as a mere individual belief, or even under a less vigorous form of human government, the religious society would have possessed neither the energy nor the discipline necessary for resistance to the deluge which endangered it." A worldly mind, that has no faith in the divine origin and power of Christianity, might have broached such speculations; and yet, such a mind might be asked how it was that Christianity without any hierarchy, or imposing ceremonial, or government established by law—Christianity in its primitive loveliness and simplicity, was kept from being swept from the earth when the whole power of the Roman Empire was at work to exterminate and crush it? But that a Christian mind should yield itself to such views is almost inconceivable.

It is moreover to be remembered, that the so-called conversion of the invading tribes in the fifth century, was merely a nominal transfer from a Pagan to a Christian polytheism. When, therefore, it is said that it was the Church hierarchy which preserved religion in the world, we hesitate not to affirm that it was rather the superstition of the barbarians themselves which sustained and added power to that hierarchy. They had been accustomed to pay the most awful reverence to their own priests; they simply transferred this reverence to the Romish hierarchy. They found in existence a spiritual authority so like in its pretensions to that to which they had been accustomed, that in

which, as in an iron mould, their childhood had been rocked; and by which, as by an iron frame, the growth of intellect and soul had been shaped and imprisoned, that they bowed before it as before the vision of their native deities. An impulse came upon them like that under which the Indian idolators, when they stood before those frowning rocky temples of Egypt, prostrated themselves in adoration, exclaiming that they had found the gods of their own country. It was the awful genius of superstition that froze into subjection the souls of those northern conquerors, rather than any influences of civilisation and Christianity, that melted them. It was the spell of Druidism, which Christianity would have broken, and supplied its place with love, but with which, as an element of their own existence, they invested the new hierarchical order and ceremonial to which they were introduced—an order and ceremonial surrounded with so much more of imposing grandeur than they had ever known, and yet having so many features of the priestly dominion under which they had been educated, that it seemed as if they did but bow before their own native religion, in a new form of power and glory.

Now when such writers become so forgetful of the nature and support of true Christianity as to say that those Northern masses of Barbarians, had it not been for the Romish Church, would have obliterated all vestiges of religion and of learning from the world, we must be permitted to say that if the Church as it then was, could have been annihilated, and a new beginning have been made in the planting of Christianity as it issued from the charge of the Apostles, religion and learning would have soon transformed those Barbari-

ans into Christians and cultivated men. If when those Northern warriors overran the Roman Empire, there had been in existence only one simple Church of Christ in all the world; if, by the determination of the Author of our religion, that religion had been restricted to one single Church in Jerusalem for the space of five hundred years; and if the period for its propagation had been detained and appointed at the very juncture when the fountains of the great deep of Northern savageism were broken up, and Huns, Vandals, Goths, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and all of Odin's brood from the ice womb of Empire had poured over the world; you may be sure that one single primitive Church, with the Papal Hierarchy out of the way, would have done more for the conversion of these men and the world, more for the good of the world in one single century, more to fill the world with the blessings and institutions of civilisation and Christianity, than the Romish Church accomplished for the space of nine hundred years. The ark of that single simple Church would have floated upon the face of that deluge, and when it subsided, its inmates would have covered the earth with the garden of the Lord. There were elements of character in those floods of Northern savages admirably fitted to unite with and be moulded by the noblest, simplest, most vigorous elements of the Christian religion. But the Romish Church, instead of converting those savages, corrupted them, corrupted their very virtues by the corruptions of Christianity! Instead of leading them into the fold of Christ, it received them into the lap of the consolidated empire of those corruptions, the vast personification of which towers before us, in the tremendous imagery of scripture, as at once the Mother of Harlots and the Man of Sin!

PIOUS LYING FOR THE GOOD OF THE CHURCH.

II. We pass to our next division in the historical argument, which is the maxim that falsehood is justifiable in behalf of the Church. This became a most important element in the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the middle ages, and a great reliance and support of the Romish Hierarchy ; one of its darkest, frowning, weather-beaten buttresses.

The maxim that to lie and deceive becomes a virtue if religion or the Church can be profited by it, is to be traced to a very early period. Its introduction does not lie at the door of the Romish Church, though its adoption, sanction, use and establishment, are hers. You find the seeds of it in the second century, scattered into the Christian garden from those flowers of heathen philosophy, of which the Fathers were so fond, that they would mingle them with the healthful blooming truths gathered from the field of the New Testament. The Pagan Philosophers were accustomed to affix to their works some name of authority to give weight to their own speculations ; and impostures of the same kind were resorted to and patronized in the Christian Church, on the diabolical principle that truth may be defended by falsehood, to such an extent that it is utterly impossible to trust the writings of many of the early Fathers. Forgeries, doubtful statements, interpolations and direct falsehoods, became so common, that you are afloat on a sea of uncertainty ; one thing, however, is certain, that pious frauds were sanctioned by the Church, and lying was adopted as a virtue. Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea about the year

315, and who died about the year 340, distinctly treats, in one of his chapters, the following theological proposition, namely, *How it may be lawful and fitting to use falsehood as a medicine, for the advantage of those who require such a method.* You may well suppose how this business of pious frauds so sanctioned, would thrive as an element in the corruptions of Christianity. The multitude of sick persons who required falsehood as a medicine seemed greatly to increase, nor was it at all the homœopathic principle on which the medicine was administered.

Here was Paul's category in perfection; *speaking lies in hypocrisy, having the conscience seared as with a hot iron.* It was the hypocrisy of benefiting the Church; and the conscience, particular and universal, became so seared, that lying in this sort became an element of prosperous ecclesiastical existence. To this source you may trace the interminable catalogue of false miracles, astounding legends, absurd stories of saints and martyrs, coined and distributed with prolific ingenuity, which perhaps even in the pages of a pious man like Bede, you need not be at the trouble to suppose the writers of them believed, such pious lies being deemed perfectly justifiable; so that if a man dug up the scull of a hippopotamus he might sell it piecemeal as the true head of Peter which had been growing under ground for the use of the faithful ever since the apostle's martyrdom. No language can describe the infinite superstition and absurdity of the passion for rotten bodies, bones, relics and miracles, with which, under the fostering care of this diabolical maxim, the world became absolutely mad. In those days, says Jortin, the bones of a martyr had as little rest as a dog

in a wheel. If this lying spirit had been restricted to false miracles and the manufacture of saints' heads and martyrs' bones, it had been comparatively harmless; but it infected the whole existence of the Church. "A curious and critical examiner of the actions and writings of the most eminent and pious doctors of this age," says Jortin, and the same thing is asserted by Mosheim, "will, I fear, find almost all of them infected with this leprosy, not excepting Ambrose, or Hilary, or Augustine, or Gregory Nazianzen, or Jerome." But the point we are now particularly concerned with is the immediate connection of this maxim and spirit and consolidation of the Romish Despotism, and its existence as a known feature in the Romish Church. I might bring up a host of witnesses from the past, but omitting minor instances, I strike at once upon a great, well known-illustration of this matter. You have all heard of the Pope's Decretals, which, together with the forgery of the Donation of Constantine, of which I shall have occasion to speak, are justly described as the most celebrated monuments of human imposition and credulity.

In this place, I shall give you the description of them principally in the words of Mosheim. About the beginning of the ninth century, the Roman Pontiffs procured the forgery, by their trusty friends, of conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and other documents, by which they might make it appear that from the earliest ages of the Church the Roman Pontiffs possessed the same authority and power, which at that dark period they claimed. Among these fraudulent supports of the Romish despotism, the so-called Decretal Epistles of the pontiffs of the first centuries hold

perhaps the first rank. Of similar authority aud value are the decrees of a Roman council, said to have been held under Sylvester in the year 324, but which was never known of by any one till the ninth century, than which nothing could be better suited to enrich and exalt above all human authority, the Roman Pontiff. In the darkness of the world there scarce remained any one either capable or disposed to move controversy respecting these pious frauds; and the history of subsequent centuries shows the use made of them for uniting all power, temporal and spiritual, in the Romish See; a thing not denied at the present day by respectable and honest men, even though friendly to the Romish Pontiff.

I might have gone more minutely into this division of our subject, and have taken other historians to describe this curious matter; I might have referred you to Fleury, the Romish ecclesiastical historian, or to David Blondell, or to Ayliffe's very admirable introduction to his great work on Canon law; but I have chosen to take nearly the words of Mosheim, whose honesty and accuracy no man dare impeach.

I shall of necessity touch upon this subject again, in speaking of the body and power of the canon law; a most instructive investigation; but sufficient has now been said to show how forgeries and falsehoods on a vast scale were used in the middle ages to bind civil and ecclesiastical authority in one, and to shore up and consolidate the despotism thus formed. In the immense labor of examining and comparing the several editions of the Justinian Code, the learned Ayliffe found *in the first book alone*, not less than one hundred and seven private interpolations of the clergy in favor

of themselves, to increase their own power and authority.

Now on the general topic of concealment, as well as lying, in the Romish Church, the declaration hazarded by Bishop Hughes is one of the most astounding we ever heard uttered in the teeth of truth. To say that it is the genius of the Romish Church to conceal nothing of her doctrines or her history, is much the same as if you should say that it is the genius of fire not to burn, or of the thick clouds not to veil the light. I shall not open the pit of abominations in the casuistry of the Jesuits; I shall not detail the catalogue of crimes and perjuries, absolved and pardoned beforehand; the dispensation to assume any heretical religion for the advancement of the Church's interest. On the general topic of concealment in the Romish Church, it might be sufficient to say that an ecclesiastical system, which admits the policy and propriety of direct lies in its support, must *à fortiori* use the less obnoxious stratagem of concealment, as is well known hath always been the custom, whenever occasion demanded it. "It is very well known," says Peter Jurieu, "that the court of Rome, being governed by the most refined politics, makes no collection of pieces that may prove hurtful or dangerous to itself; or if any such were, would not, however, permit them to be made public." Hence, the eminent historian Ranke could not obtain admission to the records of the Vatican for the abundant materials there gathered for a history of the Popes. The Cardinal Pallavicini in his history of the Council of Trent, confesses that the Romish Church mixes in her conduct carnal and worldly policy; that her present government is framed by the

rules of this world, and that this is according to the intention of Christ. That it is not God's intent to root out of our minds our natural inclinations; men are naturally fond of pleasure, wealth and honor, and averse from poverty; and it is fit to accommodate the laws and form the Church according to these inclinations, and that it is a maxim not absolutely true that evil is not to be suffered, to the end that good may come of it. Under the head of opposition to learning this topic will receive additional illustration. I need not go to the pages of history to confute Bishop Hughes' position as to the genius of concealment in the Romish Church; that Church, even in our own country has done it abundantly already; and I only wonder at the boldness of such a position, when I remember the process of expurgation resorted to in the school-books of the public schools in this city; the expurgation of all passages and lessons, though of an historical accuracy beyond question, which recorded any facts or sentiments illustrative of sin or error in the Romish Church. I hold in my hand one of these blackened and expurgated school-books; and I ask you if this midnight page is evidence of a disposition to conceal nothing in the doctrines or the history of the Church? Perhaps this page is intended for the minds of the boys and girls as a symbol of the fearless and open diffusion of knowledge. You see that by means of a lavish use of printer's ink, the types are, as the printers would say, thrown into pi; now whether it is the genius of concealment, or the genius of truth, that has had a finger in this pie, I leave you to judge for yourselves. But perhaps you will ask, What is the nature of the disastrous lesson which it was thought necessary to

conceal from the minds of the children? It is simply the character of Martin Luther, from the pen of the great historian, Dr. Robertson.

Pass on a few pages farther, and you find two leaves immutably stuck together. Perhaps this is designed for the minds of the children as a symbol of the union of Church and State, and how difficult it is, not to say impossible, when they once come together, to pluck them asunder; for you see it is impossible to get these two leaves apart, and in point of fact it is the use of civil law enforcing Church opinion that hath stuck them together. But what is the lesson so ignobly imprisoned between them, and which the genius of a system that hath nothing to conceal, has thought fit to shut out with a brush of paste from the light for ever? Ah, if Rome had never employed anything but paste brushes and printer's ink against the truth, this lesson would have had no existence, no need of expunging. It is the historian Hume's account of the character and martyrdom of Archbishop Cranmer! Perhaps, since Bishop Hughes avers that Rome disavows the union of Church and State, the sticking together of these two leaves is an emblem of the manner in which that union operates to keep the light from the people. Turn we now a few pages farther, and what have we here under the blanket of darkness, as Shakspeare might call it? It is a passage in the speech of the Earl of Chatham, in which there is the occurrence of the phrase, Popish cruelties. Now it is not the genius of the Romish Church to conceal anything of her doctrines or her history; and perhaps this blot in the page, making such an impassable gulf in the stream of Lord Chatham's eloquence, is an emblem of the evil consequen-

ces of schism in splitting and destroying the unity of the Church. But all this is plain prose; let us see the effect of the genius of fearless non-concealment upon poetry. Here is a sweet lesson from that sweet poem "The Traveller," by the poet Goldsmith; he is describing the beautiful scenery and the people of Italy, and it is in this poem, you remember, that he says that man seems the only growth that dwindles there; but that is not one of the lines blotted out; that has nothing about the Church or the Pope, or the church ceremonies in it. The lines are as follows:

> Though grave, yet trifling; zealous, yet untrue;
> And e'en in penance planning sins anew.

Now really this crusade of sectarian expurgation against these poor inoffensive school-books is such a laughable freak of intolerance and folly, that it is almost impossible to make a serious business of it. There is but one thing more wonderful than the folly, and that is, that such an insult upon the good sense, the liberality, the noble public spirit, and the freedom and fearlessness of truth, which have heretofore marked the people and the schools of this city, should have been suffered to be perpetrated.

Where were the Protestant Trustees of our Schools, or rather where was the precious material of common sense and an enlightened conscience, that men could lend themselves to the adoption of such a measure? What a laughing-stock, or object of suspicious wonder, was presented in these mutilated pages to the minds of the children! And if you say that a new edition of the school book, omitting the blackened passages entirely, is now placed in the schools, this does not mend

the matter at all. It is a singular state of things indeed, when a book that has received the approbation of all sects, and been used for years without fault in the schools throughout the nation, is to be interdicted in this city, and an expurgated edition prepared purposely to meet the caprices of sectarian prejudice. If the genius of Romanism may come in to expunge and conceal whatever is not accordant with its notions, so may every other sect that may be represented in the ten thousand varying shades of opinion in the families of this city. If this be the case, put up your painting in some public square, and invite every interested individual to come and set a black mark upon that shade or feature in it, which does not suit either his own fancies or the caprices of his priest; and then let the painting so impartially daubed by the genius of universal sectarianism, be engraved and stereotyped for the discipline and instruction of your children.

The maxim that to lie and deceive becomes a duty in the service of the Church, hath been at the foundation of the vastest acts of perfidy performed during the middle ages. The Popes acted upon it when they asserted the claims of St. Peter, and when they released men from all obligations to keep their promises to heretics. The Councils acted upon it, when, as in the case of John Huss, they excommunicated and delivered over to the secular arm to be burned, those whose safety had been promised. Both by Popes and Councils all moral obligations were confounded and dissolved. If a debt were contracted to heretics, there was no obligation to pay it; pity but the State of Mississippi had lived in those blessed days! With what perfect ease and freedom she might have thrown herself back

upon the past decisions of the Church, and told her creditors, You are all heretics, and we owe you nothing; for repudiation towards heretics is piety to the Church. "Fanaticism," remarks Mr. Prescott in his history of Ferdinand and Isabella, "is so far subversive of the most established principles of morality, that, under the dangerous maxim, 'For the advancement of the faith, all means are lawful,' which Tasso has rightly, though perhaps undesignedly derived from the spirits of hell, it not only excuses, but enjoins the commission of the most revolting crimes as a sacred duty." "Be assured," said Pope Martin V., "that thou sinnest mortally, if thou keep thy faith with heretics." "Be it known," said Pope Gregory IX., "to all who are under the jurisdiction of those, who have openly fallen into heresy, that they are free from the obligations of fidelity, dominion, and every kind of obedience to them by whatever bond or means they are tied to them, and how securely soever they may be bound." "Justly therefore," remarked a Romish Bishop, "were some heretics burnt by the most solemn judgment of the Council of Constance, although they had been promised security." The Council of Constance itself declared that heretics who had come under a safe conduct, should, notwithstanding, be punished, and that whoever had given the safe conduct should not be obliged to keep his promise. So John Huss, coming to the Council under a safe conduct from the Emperor, was condemned to the stake and publicly burnt. Now if the Romanists in this country wish to strike out this historical fact from the school books of our children, it is like tearing down one of the warning beacons on a ledge of rocks in the highway of the ocean.

Our next topic in the course of this investigation

will be the nature and consequences of the union of Church and State, in the employment of civil penalties for the compulsion of the conscience in religious things. This perhaps will be the most interesting part of our investigation, involving as it does the nature of religious liberty, the course which religious hierarchies have taken against it, and manifesting more tangibly, as we shall be able to do, the precise mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the middle ages, in the manner in which it was felt by the people. We shall see the monarchical tendencies of Popery, and its opposition to republicanism. We shall have occasion to trace distinctly the origin, nature and exercise of the dreadful power of excommunication. Our subject will take us into the literature of the middle ages, and we shall have occasion to look upon the great faces both of Chaucer and Dante. We shall see the structure of that curious body of scholastic learning, the canon law, and we shall see how religious truth could live, and yet be kept perfectly distinct from any influence whatever on the conduct.

LESSONS FROM OUR REVIEW.

And now I shall close with an enumeration of some of the lessons taught, and to be taught, in our review. I think we see distinctly the dreadful consequences of a disparity in the clergy, the inevitable strife, ambition, and persecution, growing out of the creation of hierarchical dignities and dignitaries, rising one above another, with an accompanying corruption of the clergy, till like a worldly Babel they pierce the skies, and bring down the lightning of heaven. I think we see also, as we shall develope more fully in the next lecture, the dreadful consequences of

mingling the temporal and spiritual authority, and the necessity of guarding against all approximation to the same. If in this country one particular sect should get the patronage of the State to the exclusion of others; if those religious offices in the power of the government, such as the chaplaincies of our Navy, and of our military schools and establishments, should be so bestowed as to favor a particular sect, this would be an approximation to a state religion; and the bestowment of favors in any State is never very far separated from the infliction of penalties. I think we also see very clearly the universality and disastrous consequences of the lust of power, and how infinitely worse it is in the souls of Ecclesiastics than in Seculars. It invades and usurps God's province in the conscience. I do not now think of any monarch or State that ever, if not urged by ecclesiastical councils or influences, burnt a man to death even for the most atrocious crimes; I say, I do not think of any instance, though such may be produced; but the moment an Ecclesiastic becomes inflamed with ambition, he seems to take naturally to the fire, and in the midst of it he places his victim, though the only crime is a difference of religious opinion. I think it is clear also that it is much more safe for the liberties of mankind that there should be divers religious sects watching one another, than that terrible overwhelming unity, which crushes all heresies by power, and all liberty of opinion with them. Better it were that every Christian should be in himself a separate sect, than the Church of Christ a compulsory Despotism. It was indeed this remorseless, despotic, persecuting unity to which our blessed Lord himself was sacrificed, to prevent a schism in the

Jewish Church. But under whatever form, save that of love to Christ, and a participation in his Spirit, this unity is vaunted, it becomes an unhallowed, worldly, vain, ambitious boast.

By this it came about that men came to be called Church-men rather than Christ's-men, rather than Christians. It was this conversion of the Church into a great lordly Hierarchy, instead of a kingdom not of this world. By this change Christ is displaced by the Church; this great figment of unity and aggrandizement, the Church, occupies that place in men's minds which Christ alone should occupy; the glory of the Church and the power of the Church come to be quite another thing than Christ meant should constitute the honor of his kingdom. The glory of the Church and the power of the Church are sought, not as a means of honoring Christ, and spreading the blessings of his salvation, but as a means of worldly distinction and aggrandizement. Nothing can be clearer than this, that the glory with which Christ would clothe his Church on earth is not that of title, distinction, splendor, grandeur, power, hierarchical unity, but that of adding to it continually such as should be saved. It is the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, which Christ has made requisite, a unity whereby every joint in the whole body compacted together maketh and ministereth increase and strength in the spirit of love. It is the violation and destruction of this unity, it is genuine schism and division, when one party of believers, distinguished by some self-erected and consecrated sign, says to another party that will not assume that sign, You are not of the true Church. It is just as if the hand should say to the foot, Because thou art not the hand, therefore thou art not of the body.

By God's great mercy we have in this country, until of late, been perfectly free from the stir and bluster of these unchurching maxims, although it was the *brutum fulmen*, NO BISHOP NO CHURCH, that drove our forefathers from Europe. And now you may think it strange that we hate so bitterly this sleeping assumption. But we know its fruits. It is a pithy proverb, A burnt child dreads the fire. You may say it is harmless. Yes, at present it is a harmless insult; but it has the capacity of persecution, and we cannot abide it, even sleeping. A black snake, a *cobra capella*, stiffened with the cold, is harmless; but that is no reason why we should have such venomous reptiles at the door-posts of our houses. By and by, when the sun shines on them, they will creep into our parlors, they will hide beneath our pillows, they will sting us while we sleep.

One would have thought, if a badge of exclusion must be taken, a *shibboleth* that would debar from the Christian name and privileges all who could not or would not pronounce it, it would have been either some doctrine clearly revealed in the New Testament, or, if a matter of discipline and government, some point set forth as clearly. Now instead of this, to take an ecclesiastical dignity and dignitary, such as men of all parties acknowledge is not to be found in the New Testament, nor even in the whole first century of Christianity, and to make the possession or acknowledgment of that dignity essential to the name and essence of a Christian Church, and consequently to the name and privileges of a Christian, is an assumption of arrogance and bigotry, of which the bare statement, one would think, is sufficient to show the intrinsic wickedness and

absurdity. And yet, such is the arrogance of those, who pretend that a diocesan bishop is essential to the existence of a Christian Church. They take that which is not to be found in the divine constitution of the church by Christ and his Apostles, and breaking off the signets with which the Saviour hath sealed the assemblies of his people, as branches of the True Vine, they affix a seal of their own invention, and thereupon and thereto attach the bull of excommunication to those who abide by Christ's signet and reject theirs. The men who resisted these pretensions in the face of rigorous penalties and of death itself, and who fled to this country for freedom to worship God, were, as has been powerfully delineated in a late magnificent oration, a lofty, a heroic race; and now to revive those pretensions would be to revive in theory the very intolerance from which our noble forefathers fled into the wilderness. It is to execute a bill of attainder on them, their principles, and their memories; it is for us, here in this land, the plenty and the blessings of which we reap as the fruit of their unbending integrity of conscience, to enact, in reference to their character, the same *unchurching*, intolerant proscription, which drove their bodies out of England.

THE NOBLENESS AND SACREDNESS OF OUR ANCESTRAL REPUTATION.

And we may ask, where in all the world hath it been known that a nation hath thrown scurrility and contempt on the virtues of its ancestry? Men have often feigned an ancestral origin more glorious and more virtuous than it really was; the ancient Greeks

would enshrine heroes as demi-gods, and common adventurers as heroes, when these stood at the fountain and birth of states and empires; and ever after, as the stream grew wider and farther from its source, they made that source more honorable and glorious; they magnified it in fable, ennobled it in history, surrounded it with the flame of undying poetry; but never hath the living stream of a nation's existence turned back to cast reproach upon its mountain origin. And here in this republic, for any party to do this, in regard to the noble principles and virtues of our Puritan Ancestors, is a piece of base recreancy, that every man who has a spark of patriotism in his being, must ineffably scorn. The party influences, or the sectarian religious influences, that could induce men so to belie the noble part of their nature, are a gangrene in our system, which if it be not cured, eradicated, will destroy all patriotic and manly virtue among us. The memory of the early colonists of this country of every sect and persuasion, is a possession to be guarded and cherished not by a party or a church, but by the whole United States of America. The colonists of Georgia, of Virginia, of Maryland, of New York, of Rhode Island, of Massachusetts, of all New England, whatever peculiarities of habit and opinion they brought with them, are the ancestors of this great nation, mingled their blood in the revolution; their united memory of character and noble deeds, constitutes the ancestral escutcheon of our origin; and despised be the man, whether he be now a foreigner or native, who shall endeavor to cast a blot upon any part of it. If there have been imperfections, if there have been intolerance, if there have been a mistaken religious faith, if there have been something of

the narrowness and superstition which beclouded and darkened all Europe, and out of which a part of our ancestry issued like lightning from the thunder-cloud, nay, like morning stars from the common darkness of nature, let it not be dwelt upon to their discredit. Let us rather, like Shem and Japheth, go backward with the beautiful garment of filial veneration, and not, like accursed Ham, go out to uncover a father's nakedness. Whatever would lead a man to do this marks him for the scorn of his race; and above all, if it be sectarian bitterness that would do it, it shows the mean and infernal quality of that ingredient; for I had almost as soon a man would have burned my father at the stake because of his religious opinions, as cast a reproach upon his virtues, or endeavor to blot out their memory for the same cause.

I am glad of the opportunity plainly and openly to say these things: and here I would add my tribute of thanks to Bishop Hughes, that he has put the Puritan Pilgrims and the Catholic Pilgrims of this country in the same place of grateful recollection in the heart of their descendants, that they fled from the bitterness of a religious persecution. We honor the memory of Sir George Calvert, the noble presiding spirit of the infant colony at St. Mary's, in Maryland, as we do the memory of the tenants of the Mayflower, for he did, in an intolerant age, what no other government in the wide world would do, put all Christian sects by law on an absolute equality. He went in some respects farther than the Puritans, for he rose superior even to the prevailing genius of his own Church. I say, we esteem it our privilege to honor his memory. Dear to our hearts is the memory of all the virtuous

colonists, but dear especially is that noble band, who fled to the savages and wild beasts of this wilderness, for FREEDOM TO WORSHIP GOD! Dear is the memory of the first Puritan Church, and the first Puritan minister of the colony of Massachusetts Bay; a church though without a bishop, yet as truly a Church of Jesus Christ, as the whole persecuting establishment of England; and a minister, though superior to the figment of the Apostolical succession, and though the hand of no earthly prelate ever was laid upon him, yet as divinely ordained a minister of Jesus Christ, as any bishop, from the first Pope to the present moment. I am sure that I speak the feelings of every patriotic and liberal mind in this country, when I say that the memory of our Puritan ancestors is a possession of which the whole nation should be proud and jealous.

> Our boast is not that we deduce our birth,
> From loins enthroned, and rulers of the earth;
> But higher far our proud pretensions rise,
> The sons of fathers passed into the skies!

We boast to have descended from an ancestry, who amidst persecution discovered and carried out the problem, the possibility and the blessedness of which we, their descendants, are demonstrating to the whole world, a problem which we believe to be intimately connected with the possession and preservation of liberty for all mankind, A CHURCH WITHOUT A BISHOP, AND A STATE WITHOUT A KING.

[At the conclusion of the Lecture, the Choir sung the following Hymn, written for the occasion.]

THE PILGRIM'S LEGACY.

The May-Flower, on New England's coast, has furl'd her tattered sail,
And through her chafed and moaning shrouds December's breezes wail,
Yet on that icy deck, behold! a meek but dauntless band,
Who, for the right to worship God, have left their native land;
And to a dreary wilderness this glorious boon they bring,
"*A church without a bishop, and a state without a king*"

Those daring men, those gentle wives—say, wherefore do they come?
Why rend they all the tender ties of kindred and of home?
'Tis *Heaven* assigns their noble work, man's spirit to unbind;—
They come not for themselves alone—they come for all mankind;
And to the empire of the West this glorious boon they bring,
"*A church without a bishop, and a state without a king.*"

Then, Prince and Prelate, hope no more to bend them to your sway,
Devotion's fire inflames their breasts, and freedom points their way,
And, in their brave hearts' estimate, 'twere better not to be,
Than quail beneath a despot, where a soul cannot be free;
And therefore, o'er the wintry wave, those exiles come to bring
"*A church without a bishop, and a state without a king.*"

And still their spirit, in their sons, with freedom walks abroad,
The BIBLE is our only *creed*,—our only *monarch*, GOD!
The hand is raised—the word is spoke—the solemn pledge is given,
And boldly on our banner floats, in the free air of heaven,
The motto of our sainted sires, and loud we'll make it ring—
"*A church without a bishop, and a state without a king,*"

SECOND LECTURE.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ARGUMENT.

THERE is a disposition in some quarters to regard every development of the nature of Romanism, as delineated in the pages of history, with the reproach of illiberal zeal or bigotry. We are sometimes told that we have heard often enough that the Catholics burnt John Huss, and the Calvinists Servetus, and that what we need is not to determine who did wrong in time past, but wherein is the security against its repetition in the future. And pray, how can we possibly learn to secure ourselves against its repetition in the future, but by knowing under what influences, in what circumstances, by what bodies or characters, it was committed in the past? For this purpose we must go into the depths and details of history; in regard to religious persecution, we must know who did it, and what for, by what motive, under what influences; and as there is nothing so intensely interesting as the history of religious persecution and of religious liberty, so there can be nothing more instructive to mankind. It is sometimes said that experience, like the stern lights of a ship, only serves to illumine the path that has been passed over. This is terribly true, if we are in the ship ourselves; but if we are tracing the chart to find our right course from

the experience of others, then we wish that every sunken rock and dangerous shallow should be marked; we want them marked *before* us, from the experience of those who have seen them only in the path that has been passed over, or who perhaps have made shipwreck upon them. That is the light of history, and that the way to use it; and therefore the charge of bigotry against those who would look narrowly into the nature of the Romish Despotism, and put light-houses upon those fierce jagged reefs, where lie the hulks of so many splendid and costly argosies, is illiberal in the extreme. If Bishop Hughes may make researches into the middle ages, and come to us with the astounding discovery that it is to the Despotism of the Papacy that we owe whatever of civil liberty we now possess, I claim the privilege of examining those same ages, and tracing, for my own satisfaction, the steps of the Apostolical succession, by which the greatest and purest liberty in the world has come to us here in America, not, as we had supposed, from the struggles of our forefathers against monarchical and prelatical oppression, but straight down from the most depraved, hypocritical, and unalloyed despotism in Europe. I am sure such a discovery of our parentage in the middle ages is worth looking after. If, also, our republican practice of representation can be found in their utter rejection of the people from all share in the choice of their ecclesiastical rulers, in the appointment of Bishops by Monarchs, or by the Pope, and in the election of the Supreme Pontiff by the College of Cardinals, let us also trace that amazing fact. Or if our habits of free deliberative discussion can be found in conclaves that met to deliberate on the best method and material for forging chains

for the people; in the councils of the Lateran, or the council that deliberated on the question whether faith was to be kept with heretics, and then put John Huss and Jerome of Prague into the flames, and condemned John Wickliffe's poor mouldering bones to be dug up and burned, and the ashes thrown into the Trent; let us have the pedigree; and if we have wandered away from the paths of light in the Middle Ages, let us try and grope our way back again through the darkness of the Reformation. It might be recommended to the genius that made these discoveries, to consider the question whether Jefferson himself had not been searching the records of the Papacy in the Middle Ages, when he wrote the Declaration of American Independence; there is no reason why that immortal document should not be found amidst the unequalled freedom of those ages, as well as our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount, amidst their benevolence and immaculate morality.

In truth, if any original mind will make such discoveries, it compels us to follow him; we cannot resist it, any more than we could avoid going to see the Ark of Noah, if it should be brought into one of the New York Dry Docks for exhibition. We are not therefore to be blamed for following Bishop Hughes into the middle ages; and if while our instructor is explaining to us the uses of fulminating thunder, we read also a guide-book that describes the consequences of its explosions; if, while he points us to a huge bomb-shell and tells us it was the nest-egg of liberty, we see it in the guide-book knocking whole cities to pieces and destroying thousands of wretched people at once with its missiles; we are perfectly right to come to the conclusion that such

thunder and such bomb-shells of freedom were better suited to the dark ages than to ours. If, when he leads us to the cave of Giant Pope, and tells us to observe the footsteps of civil liberty coming out of it, we, on looking narrowly, find there are many footsteps going in, but none returning, and that the cave is a vast catacomb of bones and human ashes, I am sure we are very wise in telling Bishop Hughes that we will put our liberties somewhere else for safe-keeping. If he tells us to note the genuine republicanism of the Pope, and the very great aversion of the Church of Rome to the union of Church and State, we shall tell him that our native republicanism is quite good enough, and that we do not wish to have our veins opened, and any such ecclesiastical ingredients injected into them. Our tree of liberty stands, a native tree, and any graft from the trunk of Popish Republicanism seems to us very suspicious; at all events we are sure that as our tree of liberty did not spring from the roots of the Hierarchical Despotism, so it cannot flourish under any of its dark shadows. We find that we feel the effect of those shadows first of all, there, where the baleful gloom is most pernicious, in the public schools of our children, and that they keep out not only the element of pure historic truth, but the light of heaven; but as long as the country lasts, we will have those two things in our schools, Impartial History, and the Word of God. By God's blessing we will have the sun and the air upon our Tree of Liberty as long as the world stands.

UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

III. Our third point of investigation is the alliance between the civil and ecclesiastical power, or in other words, the union of Church and State.

On this point we have to go back to the combined civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the Roman Empire. The pontifical offices in that constitution were many and important. The highest of them were united with various civil dignities in the persons of the Emperor, the nobles, the senators and leading men of the State. Here was a vast politico-ecclesiastical hierarchy, against which the simplicity of Christianity was opposed in every point. In this opposition, so far as the union of Church and State was concerned, the infant kingdom of Christ grew up, till the Emperor Constantine took it under his protection, and exercised a power over it similar to that which as Roman Emperor he had always been wont to exercise over the religion of Paganism. He took the Christian Church into a strict alliance with the Roman State, and combined in his own person, as King Henry the Eighth did first in England, the highest ecclesiastical and civil authority. He could no longer indeed be himself a Priest, and in establishing by law the Christian religion, he did in effect impose the first limitation on the imperial authority. It was the first legal acknowledgment of any right in a subject apart from the control of the Emperor, when the Emperor himself was excluded from the right of administering the sacraments of the Christian Church. At the same time, in that establishment by law, he made himself the Supreme Head of the Church of Christ on earth, assumed to himself an authority which

Christ alone possesses over his Church, and taught that Church to look to and trust in an earthly head as its protector. From this measure and this period is to be traced the mixture and confusion of spiritual and temporal power, which continued, with but little interruption, for more than fourteen centuries; from this measure is to be traced the assumption, openly, by the Church of Christ, of the characteristics of a kingdom of this world; from this measure is to be traced the almost boundless wealth and power of the Church as a worldly kingdom, and the consequent ambition, corruption and utter wickedness of the whole body of the clergy throughout Christendom.

But you will remark that this measure could not have been adopted, this alliance could not have taken place, had not the Church before that period begun to assume the characteristics of a worldly hierarchy. Had the Church of Christ retained its primitive simplicity, Constantine, on becoming a Christian, would have found nothing in Christianity to take to an alliance with the State, except its religious spirit and obligations. He would have become one of a community of Christians, who would have received him, as any other immortal being, into Christ's simple fold, but would have said to him, in respect to all worldly alliance or patronage of the State, Just let us alone, and simply give to us the liberty to extend our religion, and the same privileges, and no greater, which all the subjects of the Roman Empire enjoy, and we ask no more; we reject everything else, and we render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's. But instead of this, the Church was already prepared,

when Constantine embraced Christianity, to assume the form of a vast organized, formidable hierarchy, with its ambitious degrees, its grades of power and grandeur rising one above another, its diocesan sees, with ecclesiastical divisions corresponding with the political divisions of the Empire, and contending for the supremacy, its gorgeous rites, its judicial courts, its corporate properties, its convocations and its councils. The Emperor Constantine, in incorporating this great institution by law, and placing himself at the head of it, in legalizing its courts, its possessions, its authorities, in exempting its higher clergy from secular jurisdiction, and in compelling the magistrates to enforce its judicial edicts, did in fact assume to himself a mighty power, which before he did not possess. Nay, he may be said to have created a new worldly power, investing himself with the supremacy in it; taking, as it were, the mould made ready to his hands in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and pouring into it the element, which was to convert it from the spiritual kingdom of Christ into a consolidated body of combined spiritual and temporal power.

It is true that there was not the full organization already existing; but the tendencies in full there certainly were, the prefigurings, the indications, the suggestions of such a system; and the mind of Constantine was too acute and too quick not to note what would be of such vast utility to the consolidation of his Empire. There were potential ambitious tendencies in the Church, powerfully fostered by grades of authority, which only needed the wand of power in the hands of the Imperial Magician to touch them, and there should stand forth a vast Ecclesiastical Monarchy, the

very counterpart of the Empire, a rib out of its side, but ready to advance from a dependent monarchy in alliance, to an absorbing despotism in itself, that should cover and subdue the world. Alas! the Church herself had prepared herself for the indignity and misery of being wooed and won by the allurements of earthly pomp and splendor to a legalized establishment of alliance with the State. Instead of the Bride the Lamb's wife, the State's Mistress had made herself ready; and the Emperor Constantine, for his part, knew no better, than to believe the alliance perfectly lawful and just. The best that can be said of it is that it was a marriage of convenience and not of love, on both sides; and it resulted, in the course of ages, as most marriages of selfishness and convenience do, in misery to both parties. Yet the Emperor Constantine was a great gainer; the union brought with it a vast addition to his reputation, his authority, his influence. His Ecclesiastical Bride had, to say the least, a magnificent dowry of prelacy and superstition to put at his command. He relinquished nothing of his power over the Heathen world, but he created and assumed a new power in the Christian world, and he saw plainly that it was for his interest greatly to increase that power.

THE ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST UTTERLY FORGOTTEN.

From this time forward the idea of the separation between the spiritual and temporal power is more and more lost sight of and forgotten. In the Christianity of the New Testament, and in the early Church, it is an evident and simple element of Christian existence, and

of the Christian institutions. From the time of Constantine it goes out of being, and the effort of the Romish Church, from the period of her acknowledged supremacy, becomes, more and more clearly and indisputably and without concealment, the possession and concentration of supreme and independent power, both spiritual and temporal, within herself. In this sense, then, it may be said that the Romish Church, at the time of its most uncontrolled despotism over men's liberties, disavowed the union of Church and State, because she arrogated to herself the possession of all power in both, because she said within herself, I am the State, and from me all temporal as well as spiritual power flows. But if this assumption could not be carried out to the full, the Romish Church, compelled to content herself with something lower, always deemed lawful and right whatever union of Church and State might enable her to carry forward her purposes. She never denounced that Union, except so far as it lessened her own power; she always maintained that union if it might increase her power; and she only left it, or repudiated it, in order to rise superior to it, in order herself to control the State. Rome for example, in the very vigorous language of Campbell on the clerical claims of authority over the secular powers, "Rome always asserted resolutely, and in most cases successfully, the clergy's right of exemption from being taxed by the secular powers; but it was in order to slip into the place of those powers, and assume the prerogative of taxing them herself. This, though always controverted by temporal rulers, she so effectually secured, that Sovereigns, in any remarkable exigency, especially when they could plead some holy enterprise, such as a

crusade for the massacre of infidels or heretics, were fain to recur to the Pope, as the easiest and surest way to obtain the assistance of their own clergy. This also gave the Pope an easy method of bribing princes to his side, when he wanted to destroy or mortify any adverse power. It was his usual game to play the bishop against the king; but this, when his subalterns proved mutinous, he could successfully reverse, and play the king against the bishop."

In this place it is, that in furtherance of our argument, I may most conveniently and appropriately add, what ought not to be omitted, some notice of the famous scheme prepared in the Council of Trent for the reformation of secular persons and authorities. The whole chapter of thirteen decrees shows perhaps more perfectly and conclusively the nature of the Romish claims, and the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the middle ages, than any other document in history. The council, confident that princes will acquiesce, and cause due obedience to be rendered to the clergy, admonishes them before other things to oblige their magistrates, delegates, and other temporal lords to render their pastors that obedience, which those princes themselves are bound to perform to the Sovereign Pontiff; and for this purpose anew enforces whatever has been decreed by the sacred canons and the imperial laws in favor of ecclesiastical immunities, which ought to be observed by all under pain of anathema. Some of the decrees were as follows, namely: That ecclesiastical persons may not be judged in a secular court, not even on plea of public utility, nor however doubtful may be their clerical title. That in causes spiritual of matrimony, heresy, patron-

age, beneficial, civil, criminal and mixed, over persons and goods, howsoever belonging to the ecclesiastical court, the temporal judges shall not intermeddle, nor any appeal to the secular magistrate be suffered. That neither the emperor, kings, nor any prince whatsoever, shall make edicts or constitutions, in what manner soever, concerning ecclesiastical causes or persons, nor meddle with their persons, causes, jurisdictions or tribunals, no, not in the Inquisition; but shall be bound to offer the secular arm to the ecclesiastical judges. That the temporal jurisdiction of the ecclesiastics, though with mere and mixed power, shall not be disturbed, nor their subjects drawn to the secular tribunals in causes temporal. That the letters, sentences and citations of judges ecclesiastical, especially of the court of Rome, so soon as they be exhibited, shall be intimated without exception, published and executed. There was also an epilogue, admonishing all persons to have in veneration the things which concern the clergy, as peculiar to God, and not to suffer them to be offended by others, renewing all the constitutions of popes and holy canons, in favor of ecclesiastical immunity.

The study of these decrees may throw much light on the nature of power in the Middle Ages. The ecclesiastical power could command the aid of the secular; this always constitutes the union of Church and State, and the supremacy, in a dark period, of the clergy. There was a distinction of the kinds of power, into temporal and spiritual; but the clergy confounded them whenever they pleased, and the greater part of the ecclesiastical power was strictly temporal. "Under the general term spiritual, they had got included the more important part of civil matters, also, affairs matrimo-

nial and testamentary, questions of legitimacy and succession, covenants and conventions, and wherever the interposition of an oath was customary. Add to these that they were the sole arbiters of the rights avowedly civil of the Church and Churchmen, and in everything wherein these had, in common with laymen, any share or concern."

It is to the Emperors Justinian and Charlemagne that we are to look for the main sources of such a body of mingled temporal and spiritual authority as is here exhibited. What the effect of it must have been for ages on the morals of the clergy themselves, and the well-being of the people, almost every faithful historian has depicted, in presenting the reality of life as it was, in the events that unfolded it. The independence produced in the Bishops over the inferior clergy, when the right of election was taken from them, and the Bishoprics became regal appointments, tended to make that class the most immoral and despotic of all ecclesiastics. "Sole administrator of the revenues of the church," says an Episcopal historian before quoted, "the Bishop possessed the most ample means of plunder and usurpation; while his close connection with political transactions, and the weight which he exerted in the most important deliberations of the State, so interwove the temporal with the spiritual office and duties, and also added to his legitimate authority so much temporal power, that there were few excesses which he might not hope to commit with impunity. It is therefore without surprise that we find him at one time advancing to battle at the head of his armed attendants, and at another engaged in marauding expeditions, from motives of plunder or private hostility. His habits and

manners alike departed from the ecclesiastical character, and he grew to resemble the rude barons who surrounded him, both in the extent of his power, and the insolence with which he exercised it."

I may add to this what seems the symptom of the highest possible degree of disease in the mingling and confusion of temporal and spiritual things in the Church, the organization of the new religious order of the Knights Templars and others. It has almost always been a question whether the profession of arms were permitted to Christians, or were compatible with salvation; but the Romish Church contrived to make it, as Fleury himself has remarked, a state of perfection, and to join to it the three vows essential to a religious life.

FALSE POSITION OF GUIZOT.

It has been said by Guizot that the Church at the period of the incursions of the Northern barbarians upon the Roman empire, was driven to an assertion of the separation of the spiritual from the temporal power, as a means of defence against barbarism. But in point of fact there was no such assertion. The Church never said to the barbarians, "Spiritual and temporal power is distinct, therefore respect our consciences, keep to yourselves, and trench not upon the Church's privileges;" but she said, "The Spiritual power is superior to the temporal, which is bound to pay obedience to the Church, and to carry into execution her edicts." And this was an assertion which corresponded with the whole habits of veneration for priestly authority to which these Northern invaders had been accustomed.

They could understand much more clearly the voice of the Priesthood when it said, We are your gods, or the omnipotent ministers of God, than if it had said, We hold a spiritual authority totally separate from the temporal, and therefore you must respect us. And let me add, the superstitious multitude were much more ready to obey, as well as clear to understand, the simple despotism of the first principle, than the simple, but, to their minds, unintelligible spiritualism of the last. It is in itself one of the greatest absurdities, and, moreover, it is flatly contradicted by all history, and is a mere groundless dream of generalization, to suppose that a principle which was only acted on and understood in the severest early purity of the Christian Religion, and which had been lost sight of and reversed in practice from the time of Constantine, should be suddenly assumed in the midst of increasing corruption, and flashed forth in a preserving light for the protection of the Church from the tide of Northern Barbarism. And yet Guizot has carelessly asserted that the separation of temporal and spiritual power is one of the great benefits which the Christian Church extended to European society in the fifth century! Why! this benefit would have been nothing less than a revulsion and obliteration of the whole ecclesiastical laws of the empire, from Constantine downwards. And yet it is here supposed to have been conferred upon the world amidst the darkness and storms of a deluge of barbarians! But the same writer himself contradicts this position in his very next sentences, when he says, "There already prevailed in the bosom of the Church a desire to separate the governing and the governed. The attempt was thus early made to render the government entirely inde-

pendent of the people under its authority, to take possession of their mind and life, without the conviction of their reason, or the consent of their will. The Church, moreover, endeavored with all her might to establish the principle of theocracy, to usurp temporal authority, to obtain universal dominion. And when she failed in this, when she found she could not obtain absolute power for herself, she did what was almost as bad; to obtain a share of it, she leagued herself with temporal rulers, and enforced, with all her might, their claim to absolute power at the expense of the liberty of the subject." What now becomes of Guizot's first hasty assertion? A Church undertaking to confer upon the world the benefit of a separation of the spiritual and temporal power, and yet laboring to usurp temporal authority, to obtain universal dominion, and in order to get a share, at least, of absolute power, leaguing herself with temporal rulers, and enforcing with all her might their claim to absolute power at the expense of the liberty of the subject! If any who hear me are disposed to doubt that Guizot could have committed such an inconsistency, could so have stultified his own erroneous argument, by so clear an after flashing of the truth, they are requested to turn to pages 56, 57, and 58 of the English edition of his History of Civilisation, and read them consecutively. There is not a mind in this assembly but will see in a moment the correctness of what I have advanced. It only shows the facility of hasty, unfounded generalization.

HISTORICAL PROGRESS OF THE ROMISH DESPOTISM.

Let us now, in the period from Gregory to Charlemagne, for 200 years, and afterwards down to the Reformation, trace some of the steps of this mixture of spiritual and temporal power, this union of Church and State, and finally this centralization of all power in the Despotism of Rome.

One thing is remarkable, you will find, in tracing this union, in pursuing the course of civil and ecclesiastical power, that almost invariably the point where they meet, the point of union, is a point of enormous oppression and crime. Kept by themselves, and under the Divine law of mercy to the world, these two systems of influence, like two enormous thunderclouds, may let fall their contents on the earth in a shower of blessings; but the instant they unite, then the lightning descends, and where it strikes, burns and shatters. Just so with either the union of spiritual and temporal power in one, or the league of spiritual and temporal power for each other's assistance; the meeting is disastrous and destructive to mankind; the thunder roars, and the lightning strikes, burns, and shatters. Nothing can stand against it. The league of civil and ecclesiastical power has always proved a compound blowpipe of despotism; it can burn up everything.

The first great manifest instance of this union occurs in the year 751, when Pope Zachary, in order to gain the assistance of France against the Greeks and Lombards, assisted the usurper Pepin to depose his master and benefactor Childeric, the King of France, and to possess himself of his crown and kingdom. The Ro-

mish writers say that Zachary, by his pontifical power, deposed Childeric, and raised Pepin to the throne. Pope Zachary's successor, Stephen II., confirmed this act of usurpation, and sent a pontifical letter, enjoining Pepin and his kingdom to assist the Pope and the Romans by making war upon the Lombards. Pepin accordingly marched an army over the Alps against the Pope's enemies, and in his turn assisted the Pope to usurp the imperial dominions in Italy. The next year the Lombard king again invaded Rome, and again Pepin marched into Italy, and in conjunction with the Pope conquered his enemy, and bestowed upon him the beautiful Grecian provinces in the north of Italy, which he had wrested from the Lombard king. The motive of Pepin in this unexampled liberality, which laid the foundation of the Pope's temporal dominion, and constituted him a temporal sovereign, was to expiate his sins, and especially to secure forgiveness for his crime against Childeric. Thus Pope Stephen and King Pepin became reciprocally guarantees of each other's usurpations, Stephen by his spiritual power, and Pepin by his temporal.

Our next step in tracing the progress of this union, brings us to the Emperor Charlemagne. After the death of Pepin, the Lombards again invaded the Pope's territories, and again the Pope sought the monarch's assistance. Charlemagne crossed the Alps with a powerful army, overturned the Empire of the Lombards, confirmed the donations of Pepin to the Pope, besides adding some other cities and provinces in Italy to be possessed by the Romish Pontiff *in perpetuo*. In all this the politic Charlemagne was looking to supreme dominion, and needing the concurrence of the

Romish Pontiff; the Pope was ready to pay almost any price for such a magnificent increase of the temporal possessions of his See; and accordingly in the year 800, Charlemagne was crowned by Pope Leo III., Emperor of the West.

The donations of the Emperor to the Pope were gained from him partly by means of a forged grant of Constantine to the See of Rome, conveying from that Emperor to the possession of the Church, the city and adjacent territories of Rome. Pope Adrian had sent this forged grant to Charlemagne, who fully believed its authenticity, exhorting him to make restitution of what had formerly been given to St. Peter and the Church. Through all the confusion and uproar in the kingdom of Charlemagne, which for near two centuries followed the death of this great Emperor, the power of the Popes was consolidating, but their dependence on the Imperial Crown still remained. In the year 1073, in the Popedom of Gregory the Seventh, we have another most important era of Pontifical Power, in which the project was conceived, and its execution commenced, of abolishing the connection between the Church and State, by making the State itself dependent on the Church, by centralizing and consolidating universal temporal power in the Roman Pontiff. The foundation was laid by the Seventh Gregory, a most remarkable man, who succeeded in plucking both from the Roman people and the German Emperor all right of interference in the election of the Pope, and fixed that election in the College of Cardinals. One century afterwards another Pope appeared, prepared to carry out the designs formed by the vast ambition of Gregory, and to consummate the Papal Supremacy, temporal

and spiritual, over all kingdoms, ranks, and conditions of mankind.

This was Innocent III. He excommunicated kings, laid kingdoms under interdicts, gave their crowns and possessions to Emperors and Princes, raised the war of persecution against the Albigenses, absolving the subjects of the Count of Thoulouse from their oath of allegiance, excommunicated King John of England, laid the kingdom under an interdict, and declared the throne vacant. He convened the fourth Lateran council, in which all Christendom, East and West, Church and State, submitted to him. In the Crusade against the Albigenses, a pure, simple-minded, holy band of Christians, Innocent III. issued a rescript to all the Lords of the South, to the French king, and to the nation, to take up arms against the Reformers. All the privileges, temporal and spiritual, bestowed on those who fought for Jerusalem, were offered to those who would butcher the Albigenses.

As to the reproaches and slanders with which it has been attempted to blacken the character of the Albigenses, as if this would be some excuse for the infernal crusade against them, I simply refer you to the French Historian, Sismondi, for a fair and impartial survey of their doctrines and their virtues. To a person thoroughly acquainted with the Church of Rome, it would be sufficient seal and testimony to the real excellence of any body of sectarians, that in the plenitude of her power she persecuted them unto tortures and death; to her, an evident token of perdition, but to them of salvation, and that of God. "Those very persons," says Sismondi, "who punished the sectaries with frightful torments, have alone taken upon themselves to

make us acquainted with their opinions; allowing, at the same time, that they had been transmitted in Gaul from generation to generation, almost from the origin of Christianity. Nevertheless, amidst many puerile or calumnious tales, it is still easy to recognize the principles of the sixteenth century amongst the heretics who are distinguished by the names of Vaudois or Albigeois." Among other things, they charged with idolatry the exposure of images in the churches. Their country was lovely, their community happy and prosperous. Pope Innocent, the Fanatic of Hell, resolved to exterminate them.

Under this Pope grew up the dreadful conflicts between the Guelphs and Ghibellines, which devastated all Italy, the first party supporting the rights of Emperors, the second the usurpations of the Pope. Thus the centralization of power went on, the very conflicts that seemed to shake, in the end consolidating it, throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. For a season it was the habit of mankind to have a Pope in everything; centralization and despotism were the prevailing ideas in religion, in philosophy, in politics. The Pope in Rome, Aristotle in philosophy, and the German Emperor in political power, divided the world. But this idea of centralization, unity, despotism, admitting in religion no rivals, the pontifical power soon absorbed all others, by the very universality and remorseless simplicity and consistency of its claims. The great whirlpool of the world admitted inferior eddies to circle within itself, so they did but all tend towards the great devouring centre. Thus the various orders of monks in these centuries were so many legalized licenses to the spirit of sectarianism, that otherwise

would have burst out in hostility to the Church of Rome. The Popedom acted like the French Government in sanctioning houses of ill-fame, and gathering a revenue out of them. The pontifical power provided and sanctioned these craters for the lava of opinion, of sectarianism, as so many safety-valves, that, being kept under management and control by the great central power and intelligence, could let the steam of heresy itself collect and roar and spend its fury, since it all combined to turn the engine of pontifical despotism with more resistless, overwhelming force. In point of fact, heresies were broached among these monks, that, if they had been discovered in any organization or state that did not acknowledge the Pope's supreme authority, would have been the signal for the massacre of the inhabitants of whole provinces. Thus, if liberty of opinion must be admitted, the pontifical despotism adopted the policy, as somewhere has been expressed, and I think in Jortin, of "walling them in," and letting them play their tricks, like so many lunatics, in their separate wards, all under the seal and keeping of the Ecclesiastical Empire. This could well be done with all heresies but those that proceeded directly from the word of God, and laid open the enormous vices of the Romish Constitution. Against such as these, exterminating crusades could always be launched by the Pope's fulminating thunders. The varieties of philosophical opinion could be safely admitted, indeed they were absolutely useful to the Pontifical despotism, as giving employment and exercise to the strongest and acutest minds under its dominion, whose awakening energies would otherwise inevitably have worked upon the glaring abuses of the Church, upon the con-

cealed truths of the Gospel, and upon the ideas of popular and individual freedom. Besides, when any of the vagaries of philosophical opinion went too far, or became absolutely dangerous, the terrors of excommunication were ready at hand to cut off their sources of life, and convert them into monsters for the world's devouring fear and hatred. I am reminded of the familiar couplet in one of the primers of our childhood,—

> The cat doth play,
> And after slay.

For as a cat does with a mouse before she eats it, so did the Court of Rome in her play with heresies, and with permitted heretics; when she became tired with them, or when they sought to escape her jurisdiction, but a word and a blow was needed. And if they were scriptural heresies, the heresies of true piety, the whole malignity of that court was let loose upon them from the first discovery.

It is quite impossible to follow the course of the Romish Hierarchy in its union of all power, temporal and spiritual, in and under itself, in greater detail, from the point where we have now arrived, for we enter on a sea of miseries. It will be sufficient to indicate, as personifications of the nature and spirit of this Hierarchy, Pope Gregory IX. in the thirteenth century, under whom Death on the Pale Horse rode over the world through the gates of the Inquisition; Boniface VIII. in the fourteenth, who styled himself universal Lord, in all things spiritual and temporal, who declared in his Bull Unam Sanctam, that there is but one Church of Christ under one head, all out of which

necessarily perish; that the swords spiritual and material are both in the power of the Church, the first to be wielded by the priesthood, the second for the priesthood by kings and soldiers; that the temporal power is subjected to the spiritual, otherwise the Church would be a double-headed monster; that whosoever resists this order of things resists the ordinance of God, and that it is absolutely necessary to salvation that every human being should be subject to the Roman Pontiff. In the person of Alexander VI. in the fifteenth century, denominated the Nero of the Popes, with his son Cæsar Borgia, we have the climax of combined power and wickedness. Alexander and his son were one and the same incarnation. As the unity of the heart is to be seen in its own central action, as well as in the quality of the blood which it sends to the very extremities of the body, so the perfect nature of the Pontifical despotism is to be seen in its play in its own central temporal sovereignty. "The head of the Church," says the historian Ranke, "pursued the interests of his temporal sovereignty with greater ardor and pertinacity than heretofore, and devoted all his activity to their advancement. For some time things had strongly tended this way. Formerly, said an orator in the Council of Basle, I was of opinion that it would be well to separate the temporal entirely from the spiritual power; but I have learned that virtue without force is ludicrous; that the Pope of Rome, without the hereditary possession of the Church, is only the servant of kings and princes." Pope Sixtus IV. pursued this scheme of personal domination; Alexander VI. completed it. After a description like the dark, stern coloring of Tacitus, of the hell of crime in Italy under Alexander's

despotism, Ranke observes, "there was but one point on earth where such a state of things was possible; that, namely, at which the plenitude of secular power was united to the supreme spiritual jurisdiction. This point was occupied by Cæsar. There is a perfection even in depravity. The complaint arose that the Pope labored for the coming of the kingdom, not of Heaven, but of Satan."

Now, I wish you to remark from this review the manner in which the Church of Rome may be said to disavow the union of Church and State. It is simply thus in the sense of Boniface VIII., "that the temporal power is subjected to the spiritual, otherwise the Church would be a double-headed monster." Wherever there has not been this subjection, the Church has sought the loan and use of the temporal power for her purposes; in a word she has been contented to ally herself with the State, whenever she could not render herself superior to it; and now, wherever in all the world the Romish Church can employ the arm of the State for her purposes, that union of Church and State will be deemed legitimate and just.

Need I point to modern instances? There are some most marvellously to our purpose. You may take the Sandwich Islands, for example. I would like to ask, What was the violent introduction and establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in those islands, together with the trade in French brandy, enforced at the mouth of cannon, by French ships-of-war? Was it not the use of the secular arm by the Romish Church to accomplish her purposes? Was it ever disavowed either by the French Government or the Romish Church? It was as palpable an instance

of tyranny in the union of civil and ecclesiastical power, as can be found in the whole history of the middle ages; nor is the use of the secular power any more repudiated now, than it was in those ages. Nor can any man doubt that had our own country been in a position similar to that of the Sandwich Islands with reference to the French Government and the Romish Church, and as weak as the Sandwich Islands, precisely the same tyranny would have been exercised upon us. For why should not French priests and French brandy be enforced upon one country as well as another? We indeed are too strong; but I am simply showing that the principle, the disposition, the willingness exists, and except by individuals, as in the case of Bishop Hughes, is never, that I am aware of, disavowed. Nor do I think that Bishop Hughes' disavowal would have the slightest effect upon his own Church, if that Church should have presented to her an opportunity to establish herself by power. She would have no scruple whatever to use the arm of secular authority in her own behalf. I suppose that she would feel bound to do this by her own spiritual allegiance to the Pontiff at her head. If Bishop Hughes disavows it, so much the greater credit to him; but the disavowal is in the face of the practices and principles of his own Church in all past generations. I hope, for one, that the Romish Church in this country will bear him out in this disavowal, will remind him of it, will keep him to it. Other men have disavowed it besides himself; the great Romish ecclesiastical historian, for example, the excellent and learned Abbé Fleury, makes the same disavowal, and uncovers with great plainness many of the enormities of the Romish

system; but his voice has no effect whatever on the Church.

Bishop Hughes has denominated the union of Church and State, which in point of fact has characterized the existence of the Romish Church ever since its organization as the supreme universal hierarchy, a *historical accident*. It is a singular accident, which took 1500 years in happening, and which is still happening every day. He makes the acute remark that if God by his own omnipotence had ordered the affairs of the world differently for 1500 years, those affairs would have *happened* differently.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

IV. We come now to the fourth great principle of evil, the employment of civil penalties for the compulsion of the conscience in religious things. This is the most dreadful result of the alliance between the civil and ecclesiastical hierarchies. Were there no other alliance, the use of civil penalties by the Church would constitute such an alliance. It is vain to say that the Church does not seek such alliance; if, when the use of civil penalties is offered or rendered possible by the State, the Church avails herself of them, she deliberately unites herself to the State. It is the very principle in common law, that the receiver is one with the thief. And now, in pursuit of this point, I shall show what indeed has already been made manifest, the perfect truth of that popular view of the subject, wherein we are apt to imagine that the Church and the State were two great tyrants, who, if they had kept separate, could not have accomplished much to the detriment of mankind; and who, for this reason, agreed to unite, for

the purpose of more effectually enthralling their common subjects. I agree perfectly with Bishop Hughes, in supposing that at the period when the union of Church and State first took place, it is quite probable, that neither the heads of the State, nor the authorities of the Church, had the slightest anticipation of the ulterior consequences to which it has led. But the ambition which had already become rife in the Church, and which grew with frightful rapidity after this union, almost immediately laid hold of it as the origin of religious persecution, and the means of unlimited temporal authority and power. At first it is manifest the great bond of union was the legalization of that ecclesiastical tribunal of which I have spoken. It is very clear that such a spiritual tribunal existed by courtesy before the time of the Emperor Constantine. Being by him established by law, and temporal authority given to it, it became a mixed temporal and spiritual judiciary of irresistible power. I shall not attempt to trace in detail the history of religious persecution. Everywhere it is the history of the union of Church and State. The Emperor Honorius, in the year 414, made a cruel decree against the African Donatists, denominated heretics. The civil magistrate in Africa, fearful of offending the Emperor, by showing any favor to the Donatists, unwilling also to put the law against them in execution, consulted Augustine, who advised him by all means to use the utmost rigor as the best way of converting these schismatics, and of compelling them to come in; since it was better that some should burn themselves, as they had threatened to do in their own churches, than that they should all burn eternally in hell. It is a melancholy truth that Augustine was one of the first advocates for the severe punishment of heretics. In the

year 385 Priscillian, a Bishop in Spain, was by the Emperor, through the persuasions of some Bishops opposed to him, committed to a civil judge for sentence, and was, with some of his adherents, put to death; the first instance on record of a criminal prosecution for heresy. The laws of Theodosius against heretics, and for the prohibition of their worship of God according to their own conscience, were of inexorable severity. "The theory of persecution," says Gibbon, "was established by Theodosius, whose justice and piety have been applauded by the saints; but the practice of it in the fullest extent, was reserved for his rival and colleague Maximus, the first among the Christian princes who shed the blood of his Christian subjects on account of their religious opinions. Since the death of Priscilian, the rude attempts at persecution have been refined and methodized in the holy office, which assigns their distinct parts to the ecclesiastical and secular powers. The devoted victim is regularly delivered by the priest to the magistrate, and by the magistrate to the executioner."

The councils of the Church united with the laws of the empire, to establish the dominion of terror and force over men's consciences. Their grand business came at length to be the condemnation and punishment of religious opinion maintained in opposition to the Church. Uniformity of religious opinion was the law of the ecclesiastical despotism; the punishment of opinion was the crushing weight of ecclesiastical unity. This mixture of spiritual and temporal power was not confined to ecclesiastical courts or bodies. Bishops and other Church dignitaries became Counts, Dukes and Marquises, with temporal territory and jurisdiction. "In the acts of the Council of Soissons, about the middle of the

ninth century, Bishops are empowered to scourge and beat the peasants and vassals belonging to any of the nobles, when they deserved correction. Thus, says Fleury, the prelates mingled temporal with spiritual jurisdiction. But they carried their insolence much farther, for about this time they began to claim the power of deposing kings." (Jortin. 4: 501.)

From this time downward the path of the Romish hierarchy is almost literally tracked in blood. The history of the Inquisition is a history of war on the part of the Romish Church united with the State against the freedom of religious opinion. This remarkable invention, and the establishment of it in the various countries of Europe, and its instrumentality in support of the Papal power, constitute the most perfect development of the dreadful influence of the union of temporal and spiritual power against the liberty of man. And this institution, this horrible engine of cruelty, is solely the institution of the Romish Church; it is the offspring of the combination of temporal and spiritual power in that Church. And yet, in the language of Bishop Hughes, this combination is simply "a historical accident in the annals of the Catholic Church. It happened so; but if Providence had arranged the outward affairs of the world differently, it would have happened otherwise." The Inquisition is one of the most tremendous accidents that ever happened to mankind; the union of Church and State by which this accident happened is itself also an historical accident which was happening for fifteen centuries; but if God had made a different world it would not have happened.

The history of the crusades against the Waldenses

and the Albigenses is another of those horrible accidents springing from the accidental union of Church and State in the Romish Hierarchy. The proclamation of the Crusade by Pope Innocent III., and the army of half a million, under the banner of the Church, to exterminate with fire and sword the poor band of conscientious religionists, are the most infernal accidents in history. Such, too, was the massacre of the whole 23,000 people of Beriers. Such, too, was the comprehensive answer of the Romish Abbot who ordered the assault, when consulted as to the fate of any Romish inhabitants who might be in the city, "Kill all! God will find out who belong to him!" A ferocious expression, which, Croly well observes, passes into a portraiture of the men and their times. These were the accidents of history; historical accidents these, that make up the body of history for centuries. These tremendous events are, however, the accidents more particularly of the Romish Pontificate; itself the greatest of all historical accidents.

BURNING FOR HERESY IN ENGLAND.

We will now pass over to England, and survey one of these accidents there, that it may be seen that they were not confined to the Pontifical court, nor to any part of the Romish Church, nor to any exclusive age in her existence, but were common to all countries and times, where the great historical accident of the Romish Church itself was established. We pass to the land of John Wickliffe, to the reign of Henry the Fourth, who seized the crown by the deposition of King Richard.

In this usurpation of the throne he was greatly assisted, mark you, by Archbishop Arundel, and being resolutely bent upon securing possession of the crown, by whatever means, he courted the favor of the Church ecclesiastics. This could be gained in no more direct way, than by the punishment of the followers of Wickliffe. Their number was multiplying so rapidly, that the clergy began to regard the existing laws made to check the growth of heresy inadequate to their object. Whereupon they worked upon the king in representing the advantage he would gain by having a new law for the burning of heretics. Hence, in the year 1401, the bloody statute, called the statute *ex officio*, was enacted by the English Parliament at the instigation of this Henry the Fourth, set on by the Romish ecclesiastics, authorizing and commanding the bishops to proceed against all persons suspected of being tainted with heresy. Such as were found guilty, and would not recant, were to be "burned in the sight of all the people, to the intent that this kind of punishment might be a terror unto others." This is one of the most remarkable examples in all history of the union of Church tyranny and State despotism for the destruction of men's liberties. We see two bitter usurpations uniting for the same selfish purpose, the support of despotic power; they seek to accomplish it by the same end, and strengthen each other's ascendency by imprisonment, tortures, and flames. The formation of this statute, by the English Parliament, with the influences under which it was procured, is a historical accident that reads a most terribly instructive lesson to mankind. It was the first time that the records of English jurisprudence were disgraced by a law to burn human be-

ings for the crime of choosing their own religious opinions. This is so amazing an exercise of bigotry and infernal cruelty under the guise of religion, that it is interesting and satisfactory in the highest degree to see the precise motives under which the power and its practice were established, to feel assured that there was no mixture of piety or of conscience in it, but the most diabolical league on record for the support and success of selfishness and crime. The king sought to support his usurpation by the favor of the priests; the priests sought to support their usurpation by the power of the king; and both joined in putting men to death for the liberty of conscience. Under this law, William Sautre, the pious rector of the parish of St. Osithe in London, was the first person burned to death in England.

In grouping together the points of evil in the government of the Church from the fifth to the twelfth century, Guizot observes, that in respect to liberty, two bad principles met together. "The first was a denial of the rights of individual reason—the claim of transmitting points of faith from the highest authority downwards, throughout the whole religious body, without allowing to any one the right of examining them for himself. The second vicious principle was the right of compulsion assumed by the Romish Church; a right, however, contrary to the very nature and spirit of religious society, to the origin of the Church itself, and to its primitive maxims." A third evil and tyrannical principle Guizot mentions, that of violent interference with human thought, human liberty, private morals, individual opinions, the inward man, the conscience. Now unite these principles, as Guizot declares they were united in the Romish Church,

and you have the most perfect, dreadful, remorseless, of all despotisms. You have a despotism that despotizes and persecutes on principle, and for pretended conscience' sake. Of all fanaticism, that is the most dreadful. "With an anathematizing Deity, an anathematized world, and himself safe in the heart of *the only Church*, the zealot wants nothing that can render him malign and insolent." These are the words of an acute and powerful writer, the author of "Ancient Christianity."

The Apostle Paul was an example of this fanaticism before his conversion; and he was the most terrible enemy of human and religious liberty then in existence. He persecuted the Church of Christ because he verily thought he was doing God service; and he thought himself bound to do it for the consolidation, the unity, of his own hierarchy. St. Paul, before his conversion, was the incarnation of Churchism without religion; the prophetic incarnation in a Church abandoned of God, of that zeal for the unity of the Church, that zeal for an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which afterwards constituted the sole piety of the world for ages, and which flamed over the earth as Paul did over Judea, haling men and women, and committing them to prison, to tortures, to death, because they differed from the established religion—because they would worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Doubtless Divine Providence suffered Paul to pass through this remorseless discipline of savage zeal, that when he came out of it, he might have such a horror of religious persecution, such a dread and hatred of zeal without love, and such a spirit of indomitable freedom, as should form an example to the world. Accordingly, you see in him an eagle eye to

discern the features of that despotism which even then was beginning to cast its frowning shadows over the cradle of the infant Church. You see in him a spirit of fearless independence, a resistance to oppression, a jealousy against those who were coming in privily to spy out the liberty which they had in Christ Jesus, an electric fire of religious freedom, that you see nowhere else. Not another Apostle ever was appointed to utter that great sentence, "WHERE THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IS, THERE IS LIBERTY." It was to this man, to whose spiritual sight was unveiled, as he was guarding and praying for the spiritual welfare of Christ's Church—(her spiritual welfare, which was all the welfare he cared for, and all the welfare in danger; and not her temporal power, which he had nothing to do with, and of which she would have enough, if she sought first the kingdom of God and his righteousness)—it was to this man, thus wearing out soul and body in the flame of Christ, love to his people, that was unveiled and bodied forth from out the darkness of the future, the vast towering form of Anti-Christ, sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself that he is God. The soul of the Apostle, for a season, must have quailed before that vision; it made him ever afterwards a sadder and a wiser man. He saw, filling the whole horizon of the world, the grim features of the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition; and again and again did the vision come up to him; and, when it did, then his prophetic pencil touched into definite light, for others, some of its awful prominences. Then he spake of seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; of lies in hypocrisy and consciences seared with hot iron; of forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats. Then he said, "Let

no man judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath. Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels." Then he said of those false brethren who came in privily to bring them into bondage: "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you."

EXCOMMUNICATION—ITS ORIGIN, POWER, AND ABUSE.

Connected intimately with this branch of our argument is the history of the origin, nature, and dreadful increase and abuse of the power of excommunication. The simplicity of Church discipline in the primitive Church, you may find in the 18th chapter of Matthew, patient, quiet, affectionate, and, in the last resort, that, namely, of cutting off the offender from the membership of the Church, designed for his good and for the purification of the Church, and not for punishment. The first real abuse of this power was when Church censure came to be regarded as a punishment and a compulsory measure, or an assertion of pre-eminence on the part of one Church over another, or of one bishop over others. Even in the time of John, this evil had commenced: "I wrote unto the Church, but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his evil deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and, not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and *casteth them out of the Church*." In the case of those who made divisions and offences, contrary to the Gospel, Paul's direction was simply to "avoid them." (Rom. 16, 17.) And again,

(2 Thess. 3, 14), "to note such a disobedient man, and have no company with him, that he might be ashamed. Yet, count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother."

I have already delineated the progress of the mixed civil and ecclesiastical judicature, and the unlimited height of power to which it arose, traced so clearly by Campbell and others, to Paul's simple caution not to go to law before unbelievers, and also to the 18th of Matthew. In a like gradual manner, on such passages as have now been noted, grew up a system of Church punishments, grades of penances, and at length the supreme and awful terrors of excommunication in the middle ages. At first, the measure of excommunication was resorted to principally in reference to those who, in times of persecution, fell away—the *lapsi*, as they were called; and schisms and controversies took place concerning the treatment of such *lapsi*. The first instance of an appeal to the civil power in the discipline of the Church, was about the year 313, in the case of the Donatists, against whom severe laws were passed by the emperor. When the general councils, supported by imperial power, came to establish positive articles of faith for catholic uniformity, schisms and heresies became frequent, and theological controversies became political disputes. Henceforward, excommunication became a mixed civil and ecclesiastical weapon of dread severity and power. Banishment was connected with it—exclusion from various privileges and offices, and ineffable odium and disgrace. The bishops availed themselves of the arm of the state to put down their enemies; and, in proportion as the morals of the Church became more corrupt, the treatment of heretics became constantly more severe. The

cruel enforcement of a rigid uniformity in opinions and ceremonies formed a sort of balance to the utmost laxity and wickedness in morals. From the period of Constantine, the terror of excommunication, enforced by the civil law, increased; but, from the seventh century downwards, they began to assume the awful character and power, which at length could hurl kings from their thrones and make common men to be shunned and persecuted as demons.

Of the terror with which the curse of excommunication was regarded, even when unattended by civil penalties, and inflicted without cause, and at an early period, even before the establishment of the papal power, you may form some idea from the fact related by Theodoret, and commented on by Valesius, and to be found, both fact and comment, in the pages of Jortin, that an impudent monk came one day to the Emperor Theodosius to beg some favor, and being by him refused, deliberately excommunicated him, and then went his way. The superstitious emperor, thereupon, would neither eat nor drink till the monk could be found and persuaded to take off the curse. "This is a proof," remarks Valesius, "that the canon law is true, which declares that excommunication, *though unjustly inflicted*, is to be dreaded." What cold, grim shadows of superstition and religious despotism were at this time creeping over men's minds!

But this freak of the monk, and this terror of the emperor, were child's play in comparison with the indescribable horrors with which this ecclesiastical punishment was afterwards invested. The fabled freezing prodigies of Medusa's head, all

"Gorgons and hydras and chimeras dire,"

are harmless fancies by the side of it. I know of no-

thing that might stand as a description of it, but Milton's awfully sublime picture of Death in company with Sin, keeping guard over hell. Its fulminating bolts were demoniac lightning and thunder; they accomplished infernal purposes. The excommunicated person, by his exclusion from the rites of the Church, became abhorred of God and man; the interdict of human society was laid upon him; he lost all rights as a man and a citizen; a creature stricken with the plague could not be an object of more suspicious horror and hatred; a man was no longer regarded as a husband, or father, or neighbor, but as a brute, a fiend, an outlaw, an enemy. Heaven and earth were against him, the curse of the elements was upon him, humanity itself scowled on him and shuddered at him, when the ban of the Church marked him for universal fear and detestation. He could own no property, hold no office, receive no favor, retain neither relative nor friend. The curse of the Church froze up the life-blood even of natural affection; it could turn parents against children, and children against parents; it absolved subjects from their allegiance to kings; it set the son and heir apparent in arms against the kingly father. The curse extended to the dead; the body could have no Christian burial; and the soul under it was to be bound and buried in hell for ever. In England, in the thirteenth century, when the kingdom was laid under a national ban, all the churches were closed, all the ceremonials and institutions of religion suspended, except baptism, confession, and the viaticum in the last extremity; the images of the saints were laid on the ground, the bells were silent, the funeral solemnities were abandoned, and the dead thrown into pits. A total eclipse of the

sun at noon-day, in the most ignorant and superstitious ages of the world, would not strike half the deadly terror that this did into the human mind. So ghastly and horrible a form of superstition was it in the fullness of its power.

And this power is traced with great skill and certainty, first to the excommunicating ceremonies of the Pagan priests, second to the awful forms of the religion of Druidism; the Christian excommunication being supposed by the ignorant proselytes and the superstitious barbarians to possess the same effect with the Pagan. When the Druids excommunicated a man, the unhappy wretch, interdicted from the sacrifices, was shunned by the whole world as an infernal pest; no speech was had with him, and he was like to die from universal abhorrence and neglect. All these exotic terrors the Romish priests soon transplanted and naturalized in their own system, which they thus made infinitely a stronger despotism over mankind. No language can describe, no mind can conceive, in this day of light and freedom, how awful and omnipotent it was in this one element of superstitious power. If the Pope could have stood on the steps of his palace in Rome, and at a wave of his wand could have filled the universal world with grinning, gliding spectres, if he could have called frogs up out of the rivers, if he could have turned the dust into lice, and the day into midnight darkness, he could scarcely have wielded a more tremendous spell of superstition over men's minds. And how infinitely abhorrent from this are the whole spirit and measures of the Gospel, not one word need be said to remind you. But you will remark that this punishment, even in the darkest age, could never have compressed such an active intensity of suffering and

terror in itself, had it been merely a spiritual punishment, had it not been united with the plenitude of temporal power, had it not been able to wield the secular arm in all ways, for its execution. And you will remark that as a crisis of evil, its power was a concentration of almost all the abuses and corruptions of Christianity, and all the mistaken conceptions of mankind in regard to the clergy, and their illimitable power over the spiritual world, fostered during successive ages by the priesthood. It was the great iron padlock that gathered together, in one enormous adamantine bolt, all the chains which superstition had been winding round the human mind for ages. And methinks that Satan on his dark throne, even with his face of pain, must have grinned a lurid smile of exulting malignity when he heard the Pope on earth put his key into that padlock, and turn its crashing, resounding, thundering bolt upon the nations. I am reminded of Mr. Coleridge's terrific eclogue:

> "Where all the fiends that damned be
> Clapped their hands, and danced for glee;
> They no longer heeded me,
> But laughed to hear hell's burning rafters
> Unwillingly re-echo laughters!"

For if there could be such a scene in hell, it would be when such vast scenes of blasphemy and cruelty as required the full mixture of human ingenuity and infernal malignity, were transacted upon earth.

Here, then, in the exercise of this power of excommunication, you see the Union of Church and State in its perfection. I have already shown how, in the very deepest darkness of the noon of the world's night, and amidst the very supremest exercise of the power of the

Papacy, with all mankind trembling, shivering, and pale before it, with empires at its beck, doubters in its dungeons, rebels in its fires, it could say, if it pleased, The Romish Church abhors the Union of Church and State, simply because it could say, The Romish Church will not recognize the State as a partner or rival in power, but will rather employ it as a tool and a servant! In the execution of this power of excommunication there was such an employment. And I thank Bishop Hughes, with all my heart, that in his Lecture he has himself turned our attention towards it, though in the attempt to palliate and excuse and justify its exercise. Certainly of all apologies for the power of excommunication, and the launching of its thunders on the world, it is the most singularly amusing to say that at least the Popes let loose their thunders with equal facility against the poor and the rich, against the weak and the powerful, against rebellious serfs, ecclesiastics, and emperors. The Pope was impartial, nobly impartial, in the use of this terrific power! Certainly he was. He launched it against *all* the Pope's enemies. It was the impartiality of a power in exercise, determined to bring all men and authorities in subjection to it; so that whether the rebellion were in the uplifted soul and sceptre of a monarch, or in the lowly heart of a monk in Eisleben, or in the harmless simplicity of poor pilgrims travelling towards heaven in the valleys of the Waldenses, loose went that thunder, striking the Monarch from his throne, the peasant into fires and dungeons, and the Eisleben monk too, if God had not held him in his own hand, high above all earthly thundering and lightning. It was the impartiality of a remorseless evil will, sacrificing all that stands against it; the impartiality of a

forest conflagration, that at once crackles the giant trees, and consumes the shrubbery and the grasses. Impartiality indeed! The Church is made a vast Juggernaut to be dragged over the prostrate neck of men's liberties, and you apologise for the butchery it makes of thousands of poor people under its wheels, by telling us that now and then it rolls over and crushes crowned heads and nobles! Yes! this was the impartiality of excommunication! May God in his mercy preserve our fallen world evermore from such antics of damnation. It is almost a libel on our fallen human nature, bad as that is, to attempt any apology for them.

You may learn, from what has been said on this topic, in what sense to take the assertion of Bishop Hughes, that excommunication was the highest penalty known to the Church. It was indeed the highest, because it comprehended all others, and could direct against its helpless victim, any engines of cruelty, or all at once, which ecclesiastical ingenuity could devise, or the secular arm, at the suggestion and command of the Church, could set in motion. It was the highest, because it went before all others, and prepared the way for the infliction of all miseries and tortures; it was, as I have said of the Inquisition, like Death on the Pale Horse issuing out of hell, and hell following with it, with power over the earth, to kill with the sword, and with hunger and with flames, and with death and with the beasts of the earth. I beg my hearers to read, in Prescott's admirable history of Ferdinand and Isabella, the seventh chapter of the first volume, on the establishment of the modern Inquisition. And I beg their attention to this historian's opinion concerning Llorente's History of that infernal

tribunal. "It well deserves to be studied," says he, "as the record of the most humiliating triumph which fanaticism has ever been able to obtain over human reason, and that too during the most civilized periods, and in the most civilized portion of the world. The persecutions endured by the unfortunate author of the work prove that the embers of this fanaticism may be rekindled too easily even in the present century."

A LESSON FOR MANKIND.

The history of religious persecution reads an awful lesson to mankind. It shows that intolerance is as natural to the human mind as the love of power, and that every religious sect in turn, when it has gained the power, has persecuted. It is a terrific fact that in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Protestant Queen, more than 160 Roman Catholic Priests and others were put to death for their religion. Queen Elizabeth being the heartless murderer of Queen Mary of Scotland, it is not so surprising that she should also burn others. But this hideous cruelty has been practised even by benevolent and pious men, so that we find there is no safety against intolerance but to deprive it of power. When you have done this, you have taken the fangs out of the viper, but not before. Take the catalogue of good men of every persuasion who have persecuted even unto death, and you are compelled to acknowledge that religious intolerance seems the last element of human depravity, that ever yields to the influence of grace; it is the last demon that goes out of the mind, and the hardest to exorcise. Neither learning, nor refinement, nor natural gentleness and mildness, nor magnanimous virtue, nor generosity, nor religion

itself, are proof against it. Therefore let it never have the power.

Here I would desire the audience, if they have opportunity, to consult the tenth lecture, with its admonitory appendix, in the admirable volumes of Professor Smyth, of Cambridge in England, on Modern History; a work republished in this country under the care of Jared Sparks, L.L. D., and forming an invaluable text book. The author's remarks on the subject of religious persecution are full of instruction. He enumerates some of the best men who have been guilty of it. "Pliny, Louis the Ninth, before the Reformation; Melancthon, Cranmer and Ridley, after the Reformation. If there be any characters in history, that in every other respect but this of intolerance, are the ornaments of their nature, they are these. If these are not favorable specimens of mankind, none can be found; vigorous in their understandings, cultivated in their minds, gentle in their nature, conversant with the world and its business, refined and pure and perfect, as far as in this sublunary state perfection can be found. These are certainly most awful lessons."

But with all this, it must ever be kept in mind that there is a difference heaven-wide between the Romish Church and other persuasions, because that Church makes the persecution of heretics an article of faith! When the members of other sects persecute, they do it in opposition to their principles; for the grand rule of Protestants is liberty of the Scriptures and liberty of opinion; but the Romish sect allows no such liberty, and regards freedom of opinion itself as a heresy to be persecuted unto the death.

I would no more trust a Presbyterian with the power to persecute than I would a papist, but for this one consideration. The Romish system has the terrible

pre-eminence of having made religious persecution a doctrine of the Church. There is no denying this; it is an essential element of the Romish religion to persecute heretics, when it can be done. Here, then, is a mighty distinction between the Romanists and all other sects; the Romanists persecute on principle, as a doctrine of the Church. There is all the difference between the occasional intolerance of other sects and the habitual intolerance of the Romanists that there is between an epidemic like the influenza, which sometimes proves fatal, and a contagious disease like the plague or yellow fever.

This, of course, is the reason why we are afraid of Romanism. It is an ox, that has been wont to gore. Its assumption of infallibility alone would inevitably lead to the compulsion and punishment of heretics. And in the same measure we are afraid of any other Church, that makes the same claim, takes the same exclusive ground, unchurches other communions, and gives them over to God's uncovenanted mercies. The uncovenanted mercies of God prove in the end, when the plague has reached its crisis, when the hard carbuncle is formed, to be the ferocity of human intolerance, the rack, the dungeon, the scaffold, the stake. The uncovenanted mercies of God are red and hot with the flames of human vengeance; they are but a concealed form of the Papal thunder of the dark ages; put the bolt into the hands of Ecclesiastics, and darkness, fire and storm hold a revelry; the seven vials of the Apocalypse are well-nigh poured upon the nations. And if this claim of infallibility, and this denunciation of dissenters, and this unchurching exclusiveness, and this contempt of conventicles, and this assertion of the

Form above the Spirit, come to be united to an Establishment and thus invested with the power of the State, or having that power at command, to be used at pleasure, then farewell to the sacred possession of religious liberty ; then the air is filled with a storm of test acts and civil penalties ; then, in certain cases, dissenters, even in the nineteenth century, may seek in vain for a burial-place for the very bodies of their children ; then the theory of intolerance is boldly broached, and penalties in religious things are defended, and from religious tyranny it is but one step to civil despotism ; the ecclesiastics who put the crown of supremacy upon religious tyranny, do dig the grave and attend the funeral of both civil and religious freedom. The bridge is thrown up,

> And with asphaltic slime, broad as the gate,
> Deep to the roots of hell, the gathered beach
> Is fastened,—and the mole immense wrought on.

EVILS OF AN ESTABLISHMENT.

I do not wish to go into the history of the Romish Church for proof of this. Read over the history of England, Protestant England, from the tyranny of Henry the Eighth to the Supremacy of Queen Victoria as Head of the Church and State. Read it in the Romish as well as the Protestant historians ; in Lingard and in Dodd, as well as in Turner and Neal and Hume and Fuller. Read it, and see in it the accursed fretting leprosy of an Establishment, as the consequence of installing one sect as the supreme religion of the State, its consequence in hypocrisy, arrogance, bitterness, contempt ; ambition, avarice, and luxury in the clergy ; persecution unto imprisonment and death,

of Nonconformists, Dissenters, Heretics, Romanists, all, who conscientiously please to stay out of the reigning Church and worship by themselves. I say it is POWER put into religious hands, put at the beck of a religious hierarchy, that hath done this; or, if no hierarchy, the barest Congregationalism will do the same. The Apostle John himself would at one time have burnt all Samaria, if he could have done it. Our argument then is first against the horrible *doctrine* of religious persecution, and against the Church that maintains and sanctions it, the Romish Church, by eminence above all others. Second, it is against such unchurching exclusiveness in any Church though not holding cruelty as a doctrine, but yet holding other Churches as dissenters, and therefore opening the way for such cruelty. And third, it is against such an Establishment, or possession of civil power in any Church, as may hold out the temptation to persecute, when occasion offers, either by rewards or penalties. An Establishment carries in it the venom of persecution, because it offers the poisoned cup of power to the lips of the clergy; and power over the conscience is what no man, or council, or state, on earth, ever yet could be trusted with. So far then we include all denominations, as Bishop Hughes has rightly done, in the blame of religious persecution. But mark you, there is an infinite difference between persecution as a doctrine, and persecution as an incident; between persecution as an article of the Church, and persecution as an occasional sin of passion. Persecution *belongs* to the Romish Church; though it has been resorted to, in turn, by every other Church, the Quakers only excepted, to their immortal honor. In the Romish Church there has been the *habit* of persecution for centuries; it is a chronic dis-

ease; this is one of the lessons burned by the Papacy into the civilisation and Christianity of mankind for ages. The great seal of the Papacy ought to be the stake, the fire, and a burning saint; and in point of fact a medal was recast at Rome in 1839 to commemorate the butchering of Protestants at the festival of St. Bartholomew. It is from the Romish Church that the lesson of persecution was derived and learned by Protestants; a lesson occasionally practised by them, but by their teachers sanctioned and adopted as a religious theory. And it is by acts such as the recasting of this medal, and by other significant demonstrations, that the Papal Church does openly show to the world that she is still the same persecuting Church as ever, when persecution can be enacted with safety. It is by such acts and demonstrations as these, that the Papal Church sanctions the truth of her own portrait both in history and the Word of God, as "the Woman drunken with the blood of the Saints."

PROOF THAT RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IS A DOCTRINE OF THE ROMISH CHURCH.

Now, I am not going to let this pass, though perfectly well known, under the seal of mere generalization. From confirmation strong as holy writ will I show to you that religious persecution is a doctrine of the Romish Church. I might give you the words of Pope upon Pope, and Council upon Council, excommunicating and condemning heretics, and giving them over to the secular arm to be punished. I take the last first, and find the general Council of Trent as late as the six-

teenth century, enjoining the extermination of heretics by the sword, the fire, the rope, and all other means, when it could be done with safety. Perhaps the acts of this council were an indication to the mind of Bishop Hughes, of that better state of civilisation and religion which would bless the world; that culmination of light and glory into which it would have advanced, had it not been for the unfortunate intervention of the Reformation. But I take what is better to prove my point than the decrees of Councils or the bulls of Popes. I take the oath, which all Roman Catholic bishops at their consecration are required to take, and which, as it is extant in the Roman Pontifical, set out by order of Pope Clement VIII., swears obedience "to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord the Pope, and to his successors;" and which has this tremendous sentence, "HERETICS, SCHISMATICS AND REBELS TO OUR SAID LORD, OR HIS FORESAID SUCCESSORS, I WILL, TO MY POWER, PERSECUTE AND OPPOSE." The whole oath may be found in the learned Dr. Barrow's Treatise on the Supremacy of the Pope, which book men have well done in republishing in this country.* Now I do not want any other proof than this; I would not give a fig for volumes in

* The oath is as follows:

"I, N., elect *of the Church of N.*, from henceforward will be faithful *and obedient* to St. Peter *the Apostle*, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord, *the lord N.* Pope N. and to his successors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, *consent*, or do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, *or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever.* The counsel which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, *their messengers*, or letters, I will not *knowingly* reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy, *and the royalties of St. Peter*, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic See, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, hon-

addition. A Church that makes the ministers at its

ors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can will signify it to our said lord, or to some other, by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my power *persecute* and oppose. I will come to a council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid *by a certain messenger* hereto specially impowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy [of the diocese], by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above-mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the foresaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor anywise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these holy Gospels of God."

"Such," remarks Barrow, "is the oath prescribed to bishops, the which is worth the most serious attention of all men, who would understand how miserably slavish the condition of the clergy is in that Church, and how inconsistent their obligation to the Pope is with their duty to their Prince."

altar swear that they will persecute, is by eminence THE persecuting Church of the world; and the only reason why she does not display that feature here, is because in this blessed country, our dear republic, she cannot, neither she nor any other Church. And the reason why she does not now display this feature in England, is not because the persecuting spirit has gone out of men's souls, but because, from the time of Henry VIII. downwards, the monarch has taken the Pope's supremacy to himself, and is a Pope in his own kingdom; and the State in alliance with the *Protestant* Church now chooses to do all the persecution. For a proof, both of the humiliating dependence of the Church upon the State in England, and yet of the persecuting propensities of the English Hierarchy, I refer you to the vigorous work of Sir Michael Foster on the scheme of Church power. And if I wished to send you to an unexceptionable witness for an independent sanction of the rule of persecution as the doctrine of the Romish Church, I need only name the great, the learned, the celebrated, the pious, the well-nigh worshipped St. Bernard, who held, in the most determined manner, "the utter inconsistency of any sort of toleration with the first principles of the papacy;" and who sternly argued "that schismatics and heretics, after resisting argument and persuasion, were, by the aid of the secular power, to be pursued to death, in whatever way might seem the most sure and safe."

SAMENESS OF ROMANISM FROM AGE TO AGE, AND THE RULE FOR INVESTIGATING ITS NATURE.

I think the preceding facts and reasonings have given sufficient answer to the question whether Romanism now is the same with Romanism in the Middle

Ages. The rules laid down by an acute and powerful writer for our investigation of the nature and spirit of the Romish Despotism are founded in truth, namely, that we are to take those writers, who have occupied high stations in the Church, and those times when the Church was in her prosperity, and enjoyed an unrestricted authority. You can no more judge the nature of the Papal Hierarchy by the writings or assertions of a dignitary born and educated in America, than you could determine the nature of a tiger by seeing the splendid creature as docile as a kitten at the feet of Herr Driesbach: you must meet it in a jungle, and whether in its native woods, or in any other woods, it is no matter. Undoubtedly, the genius of Romanism in this country is tamed; let me rather say, in the words of the eloquent apostrophe of Curran to the freedom of Great Britain, it is destined, by touching the sacred soil of a free religious republic, to stand redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled, with the tiger transformed to the lamb, the vulture to the dove. But as to the essential nature of Romanism in all times and countries, the words of that writer (the author of "Spiritual Despotism") to whom I have referred, are worth pondering. "The difference of style and feeling," he says, "occasioned by the Lutheran schism is very clearly perceptible in the Romanist writers of all classes; for while the bold and intemperate are far more extravagant and impudent, than were their predecessors of the same stamp, the reasonable, the conciliatory, and the philosophic, labor with the utmost diligence and ingenuity to soften the features of the Romish tyranny, to excuse its intolerance, to recommend on general grounds its superstitions, and to bring it, as far as possible, into accordance with the Spirit of Christianity,

and with the feelings and usages of modern times. But as we are bound in fairness to reject the exaggerated Romanism of the one class of modern writers, so should we pass by, as unauthentic and spurious, the novel liberality, and the spirituality of the other. We do not ask Fenelon, or Pascal, or the Jansenists, or Dr. Doyle, or Mr. Butler, what Romanism is, any more than we put that question to certain infamous Spanish Jesuits of the seventeenth century: but turn to the Popes, and the authentic doctors of the middle ages. The principles avowed by these high authorities, and the practices founded upon these principles, are consistent one with another; are necessary parts of the great ecclesiastical theory; and are such as must, in every age, be professed and followed by the Romish Church, where she enjoys full liberty, and is not compelled to adapt herself to political necessities. If Protestantism were annihilated, and princes once more brought down to their place, as the obedient sons and champions of the Church, then this Church would be and must be the very same in spirit and in practice that it was in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. That which makes modern Popery more tolerable, and in some respects less pernicious to a people, than ancient Popery was, is precisely that admixture of better notions, which it has furtively obtained from Protestantism. But all such mitigations and corrections the consistent Romanist must regard as adulterations, and must wish to exclude and repel."

Here I would refer you to a series of significant questions bearing directly on the point before us, and to be found in a journal, which no man will suspect of hostility to Romanism, the New York Churchman. The passage I quote constitutes one of the most sen-

sible, judicious, pointed articles to be found in tha paper.

"Of course we do not hold the modern adherents of Rome accountable for the sins of their fathers. All of us certainly may find enough in the history of the past to destroy our boasting, and to awaken the sentiments of humility and penitence. But it is fair to ask what sense have Romanists of these abuses, and what security against their recurrence? Is the system of indulgences restored to its primitive limits, or are they still dispensed by the Pope as a pretended means of abridging the punishments of the future life? Is the Pope content with the primacy which was once and might again be beneficent* in its tendency, or is he accounted the bishop of bishops and lord of lords? Has the Church in any particular country, say in the United States, ultimate authority in matters not of faith, or is the ultimatum of differences still an appeal to Rome? Is the election of Bishops for American Sees confirmed in America or at Rome? Are the Scriptures acknowledged to be the Christian's BIRTHRIGHT which the clergy are in duty bound to keep before the faithful, or are they merely allowed to be read under favor? Are the laity allowed a voice in the choice of pastors and bishops? And since we have no union of Church and State, and consequently no check on the part of civil government against the aggression of a foreign spiritual power, it is important to ask whether the American laity are admitted to unite with the clergy in the control of temporalities, and in legislating on those matters (and of course those only) on which particular churches are competent to legislate, or whether all these matters are left exclusively to a clergy *in* but not *of* the United States, and responsible to a foreign Potentate?"

These questions are full of significance. The answer to them condemns the system of Romanism in every point, as a system of abuses, against the recurrence of which we have no security. This chapter of interrogatories furnishes a good close to our present argument. We have left three points as yet untouched.

---

* Which never was and never could be beneficent, except by God's prerogative of bringing good out of evil. The Papal Primacy was always evil, and almost only evil, continually. And it was always in direct contravention of the prohibition of our Blessed Lord, "Call no Man master on earth, for all ye are brethren."

In my next lecture I propose to dwell upon the disastrous influence of the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power, in the governments of the middle ages, upon learning and literature. The body of the Canon Law will come under examination; and in this connection I shall show the influence of the Papacy and the Church in repressing all attempts after freedom. I shall show the reasons for the jealousy of the Romish Hierarchy against the Scriptures, and the tremendous consequences that would follow, if the Bible could be excluded from our schools, and kept in the iron chest of the priesthood. I shall endeavor to redeem my promise of looking upon the great faces of Chaucer and Dante. I shall also have a gaze at the greater countenance of that greatest enemy of the Romish despotism—MARTIN LUTHER.

CONCLUSION.

And now I shall only add the mention of what, besides the disenthralling influence of our Republican freedom, is our only reliance for the change and regeneration of the Romish Church in this country—the descent of the Holy Spirit on people and priest. When that baptism by the Holy Spirit of God takes place, which every Church is to receive from Heaven, then will all the leaven of hierarchical despotism be cast out; then will oppression cease; then will the rights of the people be recognized and their privileges preserved; then will the Churches of Christ be one vast brotherhood; then will Ephraim no more envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim; then will that unity of love be prevalent, which our blessed Lord requires, and without which all

other unity is worthless; then will there be, in every direction, the kindest charity and piety, but no pride; then will Christians, as Paul requires, receive one another, but not to doubtful disputations, and all sects will be found vying with one another not to spread their own name, but the knowledge of the Saviour; not to eject each other from the missionary field, but to fill the world with love and mercy.

We trust in God that this spirit shall prevail over every other, and when it does, then shall be the time when there shall be nothing to hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain. Then his sacred watchmen shall see eye to eye; and as he of one persuasion, in that far off region where the darkness struggles with the light, shall cry to another, Watchman! what of the night? the other shall answer, The night is past, and a morn of glory dawneth! Yea, even now it spreads, it runneth as the light from heaven, it tips the mountain-tops with glory, it pours into the lowest vales its flood, it rushes, it bursts over all the earth! Yea, this is the coming and kingdom of the Son of God; this is the ineffable unity of the Church of Christ, a unity of light and love, peace on earth, good will to man glory to God in the highest.

HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by
SAXTON & MILES,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

S. W. BENEDICT & CO., PRINTERS,
128 Fulton Street.

HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM.

THIRD LECTURE.

NATURE OF THE ARGUMENT.

The fifth point to be taken up in our argument, is that of the opposition of the Church to the diffusion of knowledge and learning. Under this head comes the jealousy of the Romish hierarchy against the Scriptures. We shall first show the commencement of this opposition against learning, and then show the exclusion of the Bible as the climax of it. This survey will reveal the disastrous influence of the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in the governments of the Middle Ages, especially in the government of the Papacy, upon the interests of literature and science, as well as of religion. In dwelling upon the anti-republicanism of Popery, I shall make a sixth point, not included in the original division of the historical argument, but growing, as we shall see, directly out of the consideration of the jealousy of the Romish Church against the Scriptures.

V. We are to consider, then, the influence of the Romish Church, as a mixed government of civil and ecclesiastical power, upon literature, especially in the hostility of that Church against the Holy Scriptures. We take first the manner of its commencement amidst the early corruptions of Christianity.

PERSECUTION OF HERETICS AND PROHIBITION OF BOOKS COMMENCING TOGETHER.

The empire of superstition is founded upon ignorance and darkness. If, then, there be a superstitious religion in the world, there will be along with it in the mind of its votaries, and especially in the soul of its hierarchy, an instinctive presentiment against the spread of knowledge, a sure conviction that light is not good for despotism. Accordingly, the moment the corruptions of Christianity had arrived at that point, where they were so startling that concealment became necessary, and especially at that point where superstition instead of religion became the prominent and ruling characteristic, then and there that instinct against light and knowledge began to manifest itself. It had been of necessity preceded by a great neglect of knowledge, and great prevailing ignorance; a crisis of disease in the mental eyesight had arrived, in which the light had become painful to be borne, and now the windows must be darkened and the light shut out. It is remarkable that the persecution of heretics, and the prohibition of books, commence about the same period; the stifling of heresy by force, and the suppression of knowledge, begin together. About the year 384 Priscilian was put to death for alleged heretical opinions.

About the same time Jovinian, who wrote in favor of marriage and social life against monks and celibacy, was seized, whipped, and banished to a rock on the coast of Illyria. This was under the Emperor Honorius; one of the earliest instances of the use of the temporal by the ecclesiastical power. The Church of Rome, at this early period, before she had become the Church universal, was foremost in the extinction of reason and true Christianity. The opinions of Jovinian were also formally condemned in the year 390, by a Council held under St. Ambrose at Milan. And now, mark you, we have in the Council of Carthage, held in the year 398, the first instance in the history of the Church, of a canon framed, forbidding the study of secular books by bishops, and of heretical books, except by necessity. This is well marked as a crisis in the history of Christian literature. It indicated the activity of the instinct of superstition against reason. For, what are heretical books? Why, in the age of superstition, such books as throw light on the dark and increasing corruptions of Christianity are heretical; such books as those of Jovinian against monkery, and Vigilantius against the worship of martyrs and their tombstones. In such an age, a canon against heretical books is a canon against light, purity, freedom. And in proportion as superstition, darkness, despotism, are on the increase, liberty and light become more marked and distinguished as heresy, because corruption and bondage become the reigning religion. Therefore most admirably and truly says Jortin, "If in the middle and lower ages of the Church you want to find men, who had the fewest dangerous errors, you must seek them not amongst the *Catholics*, but amongst the *heretics*."

At this time and afterwards, the tombstones of the martyrs, and the skulls, teeth, shoulder-bones and petrified breath of saints, with ten thousand anomalous relics, began to be the school-books of the clergy and the common people. They were for a season the Scriptures of the world; and in such literature the most profoundly ignorant and vicious were the aptest scholars. In the year 529 an edict of the Emperor Justinian closed the schools of Athens, just at the period when, having done all the evil they could in the corruption of Christianity, they might possibly have begun to do good in the preservation of something like learning, amidst the tide of that corruption. And now, when the northern barbarians poured upon the empire, the dignitaries of the Church, finding that they possessed an unbounded fund of superstitious reverence for the priesthood, and knowing from experience that ignorance and darkness are the parents of superstition and credulity, found it for the interest of the Church to perpetuate the blindness and prejudice of the multitude. The staple of the public reading being books of martyrs and lives of the saints, stuffed to the full with monstrous legends and miracles, the world continued to recede farther and farther from the light, and to become more and more afraid of it. From the beginning of the ninth century, it was the custom of the Popes to forbid men to read heretical books, and also to condemn such books to the flames. But for many centuries there was as little need, almost, of any direct canons against the spread of knowledge, as there would be at midnight, of a law that the sun shall not shine between the hours of twelve and two o'clock.

ACTIVE OPPOSITION AGAINST SCRIPTURAL KNOWLEDGE.

As soon as the Reformation began to dawn, then the watch-dog of superstition began to bark, then the instinctive presentiment of danger from the approach of knowledge grew active. Then Pope Martin the Fifth condemned and excommunicated the Wickliffites and Hussites, and in England the Romish Church forbade the reading of any of Wickliffe's tracts, and the translation of any portion of the Scriptures, as also the reading of such translation. Next, Pope Leo the Tenth prohibited the reading of all the books of Luther under pain of excommunication, and after that, other Popes excommunicated all who should read the books of heretics. You will remember that all this while both the Scriptures and the services of the Church were in an unknown tongue; the power of Rome was therefore safe from any evil on that score. In the eleventh century, Pope Gregory the Seventh made a decree declaring that many evils and heresies had sprung from the people being suffered to understand the Romish worship, and that God does not wish men, and especially ignorant men, to understand, and that no people should be permitted to use any language in the worship of God that they do understand. The language of the Pope is as follows: "In our frequent meditations upon the holy Scriptures, we have discovered that it has been and still is pleasing to Almighty God, that his sacred worship should be performed in an unknown language, in order that the whole world, and especially the most simple, may not be able to understand it. In a known language the service would soon

excite contempt and disgust, or it would happen that the common people, by repeating so often that which they could not comprehend, would fall into many great errors, from which it would be difficult to withdraw the heart of man."

THE POLICY OF CONCEALMENT.

It might seem almost incredible that a man in his senses could utter such sentiments; but the truth is, that this rule of Pope Gregory is the rule of the Romish Church. I have been personally in almost all Roman Catholic countries, and attended the Romish service, and I do not remember that I have ever seen the service performed in a language that the people could understand. Now it could not be made more manifest than by these facts, that the policy of concealment is the policy of the Romish Church; it would not be possible for language to render this more evident; it stands out in every part of her history. And this policy, it is evident, is the foundation of her power; by it alone was she able, so long and so unquestioned, to maintain the establishment of her abuses. By keeping all knowledge in her own hands, and especially all knowledge of divine things, she kept an inexhaustible material and spring of power over the common people. For she could palm upon them anything she pleased in the shape of religion, and could give to rescripts that ministered solely to her own aggrandizement and the consolidation of her own despotism, the aspect of devotion and the authority of the voice of God. Her empire could not be shaken so long as the Scriptures were kept from the people, and all sacred services were in an unknown tongue.

The maxim of Lord Bacon, that knowledge is power, never received a more tremendous illustration and realization, than in the despotism of the Romish Priesthood over mankind. It would have been eternal, could they have still kept all divine knowledge to themselves, to give it to the people only in such portions as suited their own purposes. You cannot but see that such dominion affords to priestcraft unlimited scope and control.

EXCOMMUNICATED BOOKS, MUTILATED EDITIONS, AND EXPURGATORIAL INDEXES.

A great step in the prohibition of learning, after, in the dawn of the Reformation, such steps became necessary, was the preparation of catalogues by the Inquisition of such books as were prohibited to be read. King Philip of Spain, in the year 1558, caused that Catalogue, made more ample, to be printed. Paul the Fourth put into that catalogue, among other books, the annotations of Erasmus on the New Testament. Sixty-two printers were also named, all whose books were prohibited under pain of excommunication. But in addition to all this, an expedient was adopted, which more than anything else proved effectual for the purpose of concealing the truth and baffling the light, which was, not that merely of suppression and prohibition, but, where it was impossible, by reason of the great currency of certain works, to suppress them, that of publishing a mutilated and adulterated edition of them. These editions, which they had the policy to render the best extant in their execution, being taken for genuine, and as such circulated, were copied by

other printers, and thus these corruptions became so widely extended, that it was well nigh impossible to get at the truth. For they interpolated what would suit their purposes, as well as expunged what did not; and though there was an Index Expurgatorius published at Rome in the year 1607, containing specifications and condemnations of such passages as had been blotted out, yet that index being now extremely rare, it is rendered very difficult to ascertain the real sentiments of many old authors of great name, both ecclesiastics and historians; and hence it may often happen that in controversies with the Romanists they may seem to gain a victory on certain points, because the books of reference are so miserably garbled, that the truth is in no man's hands. So late as the year 1595, Pope Clement the Eighth published a decree that all the books of Catholic authors written since the year 1515, should be corrected, not only by retracting what is not conformable to the doctrine of Rome, but also by adding what may be judged proper by the correctors. The reason for taking the year 1515 is, that many Roman Catholic authors after that period, moved by the light poured in through the books of Luther, had acknowledged some corruptions and iniquities in the discipline and court of Rome, which it did not suit the policy of that court to admit as concessions in favor of the Reformation. So the Pope published his decree of expurgation and correction. Moreover, these revisals of books were not confined to religion, but extended to general literature, and the Pope also claimed the exclusive privilege both of prohibiting and licensing for the press in all countries of Christendom acknowledging his authority.

Now if to all this be added the Pope's Bull in this nineteenth century against Bible Societies, and against the liberty of opinion, we shall have a complete running comment on the declaration of Bishop Hughes that it is not the genius of the Romish Church to conceal anything of her history or her doctrines. Possibly the plan of concealment adopted by that Church for centuries is an historical accident, similar to the accident of the mixture of temporal and spiritual power in the Church of Rome, for fifteen hundred years. It is impossible not to connect with the expurgating process which I have noted, adopted by the Popes, the same process in miniature introduced under the influence of Romanism into the Schools in this city. In the sixteenth century it was a process adopted in regard to ponderous tomes and great authors; in this present century, and in our own country, it works upon the school-books of our children to garble and expurgate them, on precisely the same plan of excluding from the light everything that could be construed to bear against the doctrine, discipline, practice and reputation of the Church of Rome. In the 16th century it worked upon huge folios; in the nineteenth century it launches a crusade of printer's ink and paste brushes against heretic primers and offending a, b, c's.

STEPS OF THE ROMISH HOSTILITY AGAINST THE SCRIPTURES.

There is a still more reprehensible effort, not only to dephlogisticate our school-books, but to exclude the Bible itself from our schools, which must be charged directly to the allied influences of Romanism and Infidelity. To get the Word of God out of our schools would be to

do something towards the restoration, in the nineteenth century, of the literature of the Middle Ages. The steps of this hostility against the Word of God, and the reasons for it, are of such immediate connection with the question of the influence of the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power upon literature in general, that I am of necessity compelled to dwell somewhat at length upon them. Accordingly, I find it stated, as the first instance of distinct prohibition of the Scriptures, that the Council of Toulouse, in 1229, strictly prohibit the laity from possessing the books either of the Old or New Testament in their vernacular tongue. Doubtless, such prohibition would have been issued earlier, if translations had been earlier commenced, with heresies against the Papacy founded thereupon. The Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, declared that if the Holy Bible were translated into the vulgar tongue, and indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men would cause more evil than good to arise from it. And they declared that if any one should have the presumption to read or possess the Scriptures, without written permission of bishops or inquisitors, he should not receive absolution, until he should have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. The same council declared that the traditions of the Romish Church were to be received with equal reverence as the sacred Scriptures, and that he who despised them should be accursed. Now the traditions of the Church were possessed by the people in their vulgar tongue, and so the traditions of the Church were in effect the people's Bible. This was a great step towards annihilating the influence of the sacred Scriptures; *making the Word of God of none*

effect through human tradition. Pope Paul the Fifth, in a commentary on one of the works of Fulgentius, declared that standing too much upon the inspired Scriptures, if it were generally done, would certainly ruin the Catholic faith. The Papal Bishops at Bononia, after the commencement of the Reformation, advised that "by all means as little of the gospel as might be, especially in the vulgar tongue, should be read to the people, and that that little which is in the Mass ought to be sufficient; neither should it be permitted to any mortal to read more. For so long as men were contented with that little, all things went well with them; but quite otherwise since more was commonly read. That, in short, the Scripture is that book which, above all others, hath raised those tempests and whirlwinds, with which we were almost carried away. And, in truth, if any one diligently considers it, and compares it with what is done in our Church, he will find them very contrary to each other, and our doctrine to be not only very different from it, but repugnant to it." "As to the books which are distributed by the Bible Society," say the Irish Papal Bishops to their clergy and people, "under the name of Bibles or Testaments, as they treat of religion, and are not sanctioned by us, or by any competent authority in the Catholic Church, the use, the perusal, the reading, or retaining of them, is entirely, and without any exception, prohibited to you."

REASONS FOR THIS HOSTILITY.—FIRST REASON.

The reasons for this hostility of the Romish Church against the Scriptures grow directly out of the nature of the Romish Hierarchical Despotism. The Scrip-

tures are opposed to the bondage of form, and to a compulsory uniformity. The object of the Word of God is the life of God in the soul of man. Form, *as it springs from that Word*, helps, nourishes, increases, and developes in beauty, that life. But form, apart from that Word, and not the development of that life, becomes, if insisted on, idolatry and despotism. If form is the natural expression of that Word, the expression and development of that life, it is good; and in proportion as the Word prevails, and the life which follows it, the form which is its natural product will prevail also. But form, as it springs from the Word and the life, is elastic and flexile, not rigid and monotonous. It is to the soul as a coat of flexile mail to the body, protecting and sustaining it, but bending with every movement. It is not as a Procrustes' bed, on which every man must be broken. Form, as it springs from the Word and the Life, is like the variety in the life of nature; you have the oak for one climate, and the palm-tree for another; to insist that everywhere there should be but one form, or a prodigious, massive, tyrannic unity of the Church in one form, is as absurd in the kingdom of grace, as it would be in the kingdom of nature, if you attempted to reduce every development of life to the form of one of its productions.

There is one way in which you may produce uniformity; it is by freezing. When you freeze water, you may cut it, you may cool everything else with it, you may shape it into statues, and you may worship them, if you will, as beautiful as they are cold. But while the water of life *flows*, it will flow *freely*. The most disastrous consequences must result from aiming to produce a dead, despotic, mechanical uniformity. If

life be thus shut in, it will sooner or later burst its prison walls in pieces. We are told by chemists that salts in crystallizing frequently enclose mechanically, within their texture, particles of water, by the expansion of which, when heated, the salt is burst with a crackling noise into smaller fragments. This phenomenon is known by the name of *decrepitation*. Now, a despotic establishment, that would crystallize the whole world into its own form, or otherwise would allow the world no form of life at all, is sure, some day, to *decrepitate*. When the Word of God, the water of life, gets into it, as it did in the time of Luther, it inevitably bursts in pieces.

SECOND REASON.

Next to this despotic bondage of form, the system of Romanism is a despotic bondage of opinion, which the Word of God opposes. The Word of God contains the elements of individual freedom. It takes the conscience into God's keeping; and when this is done with any man, or any body of men, there is an end to bondage. There is no more room for Ecclesiastical or Political Despotism. Putting the conscience into God's keeping, you have put an element into the soul that will heave a despotic society like an earthquake. You have taken away from Despotism, civil and ecclesiastical, its place to stand upon, and the lever of its power. You have disarmed Superstition, and broken her terrific wand. Putting the conscience into God's keeping, bringing it under the power of God's Word, you at once enlighten it as to Right and Wrong, you give it an instinctive knowledge of the lines where duty to God and obedience to man clash, and the indi-

vidual becomes an immortal, independent being, God his only master! The great reason, therefore, why the Church of Rome proscribes and puts the Word of God under an interdict, is because it releases the human mind from bondage. Its perusal, the Romanists say, produces heresies, and individual scriptural opinions, in the view of Rome, are heresies. And the Church of Rome has always known how to manage and baptize every kind of heresy, but that produced by the Word of God. If a restless mind arose, fanatical, energetic, ungovernable, burning with the fires of reform and change, all that need be done was to canonize its zeal, to put the great seal of the Church upon it, and then let the comet go, no matter if it drew after it the third part of heaven. St. Francis and St. Dominic shed their baleful fires in the service of the Church, for theirs was a zeal stamped with the Church's infallibility. But if a mind became imbued with the fire of divine truth, there was no controlling it; opinions formed in the study of God's Word would not take the seal of the Holy See; and such minds, being in no possible way to be worked into the system, must be cast out of it, as living stones, dangerous in an Idol's Temple, and therefore to be burned and ground to powder. The Romish Church would have done thus with Wickliffe and Luther, had not God protected them; or otherwise, had not their heretical opinions grown out of the Word of God, threatening to *decrepitate* the whole despotic hierarchy, the Romish Church would have disposed of Wickliffe and Luther by just canonizing them, and letting them flame away in their eccentric orbits, as new incarnate metempsychoses of the spirits of St. Francis and St. Dominic.

THIRD REASON.

The system of Romanism is a great religious monopoly. The whole trade in religion is in the power of the Priests. No man is permitted to set up for himself, or to visit any other market. The articles he shall traffic in must be marked by the Church, or they are contraband. From the Word of God he must not take but just what the Church teaches him. If he come to the Word of God asking for bread, and the Church offer him a stone, he must take it; if he come for a fish, and the Church give him a serpent, it is all one; if he ask for an egg, and the Church offer him a scorpion, he must take it, believing it to be an egg. He must take tradition as of equal value with inspired texts; and of such things it may be said, he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper.

But the Word of God breaks down all such monopolies. Its own institutions are the monopolies of no particular Church, and it contains within itself the security of the forms and institutions, which it does itself ordain, in the interpenetration and imbuing of the conscience with the very same living spirit, out of which those institutions grow. Otherwise, it does not desire their establishment. It would not, if it could, bring all men into a dead uniformity of professed obedience without the spirit. It lays no penalties; it is a voluntary system. If a man's conscience is imbued with its divine spirit, the man will obey it; if not, it uses no compulsion, binds no man to the stake, makes no man answerable to an inquisition, applies no racks

to the joints, to break the soul through the dislocation of the bones; nor does it, on the other hand, annex civil rewards or sinecures as the price of Church membership, or of obedience to the Established Hierarchy. Its kingdom is not of this world.

FOURTH REASON.

The Word of God teaches a man his individual worth, and makes him feel his individual responsibility. It teaches him that he belongs not to man, nor to a system, nor to a king, nor to a state, nor to a hierarchy, but to God. It teaches him to call no man master on earth. It teaches him that his salvation is in no human hands but his own, and that to his own master, Christ, he standeth or falleth. It teaches him the personal and individual conditions of salvation, faith in the Lord Jesus, and repentance towards God, and that no priest and no form can save him. The system of Romanism denies a part of this, and conceals the rest. It is a system of unqualified submission, not to God, but man. It is a system merging the individual in the mass, combining with the despotism of States and Monarchies to deprive men of individual freedom, and preparing them to be themselves trampled on, or to be used as instruments in beating down the liberties of others.

FIFTH REASON.

A great cause of the opposition of Romanism to the Word of God is to be found in the delineation and limitation contained in that Word of the character and functions of the Christian ministry. The system of Romanism has perverted that ministry from the cha-

racter of a ministry of the Bread of Life, the Word of God, to the soul, into that of a priesthood of ordinances and forms. This perversion the Word of God opposes, bringing back the ministry to its true character and work. The Word of God secures to the ministry that honor which God puts upon it, but preserves it from that strife after aggrandizement which he forbids it. Nowhere will the Christian ministry be better known appreciated, loved and powerful, than where the Word of God is universally and thoroughly known and obeyed; but where this is the case, there the danger of a priestly despotism is removed, because there will be so clear a knowledge of the functions of the ministry, as will prevent any overstepping of them, and so instant and instinctive a perception of inconsistency in the ministry, as will keep evil in check. Hence, a Priesthood that wish to be despotic and supreme, will keep the knowledge of the Word of God as much as possible to themselves, because that Word so clearly defines and limits their authority. Where the Word of God is universally known, by people as well as Priests, then there is much less danger of priestly domination.

PRIESTCRAFT COMES FROM IGNORANCE AND NEGLECT OF GOD'S WORD.

In all ages infidels have talked much against Priestcraft; and they have attacked the Word of God, as if, could they only get rid of that, Priestcraft would be at an end; whereas, the Word of God, and the universal knowledge of that Word, is the greatest safeguard against Priestcraft that can be conceived of. Nay, it

is our only safeguard, for where there is not a revelation from God, there will be a pretence to it; where there is not a revelation from God, there will be a revelation from the Devil. The greatest amount of Priestcraft has always been where there was either no revelation, or where the Word of God was concealed, or withdrawn out of notice. Where this has been the case, the Priests have had it all to themselves. They have had full scope either to pretend to a new revelation, to alter the old one, or to add to it at their pleasure; in short, to affix the Divine sanction to whatsoever of their doings they pleased. The old Hebrews were never more completely under the tyranny of a priesthood, than when the Word of God was utterly hidden or disregarded, so that scarce a single copy was left in existence. They had then a Priesthood more despotic and sanguinary than that of the Druids; a priesthood which brought their kings under its power, made their sons and daughters to pass through the fire unto Moloch, and bound and sacrificed soul and body in the superstitions of demons. Just so, the Egyptian Priesthood owed the maintenance of their awful power over the people to the pretended possession and command of a secret sacred knowledge, which, whether it were recorded in books, or preserved in unwritten traditions, so long as it was in possession of the priests only, and could be kept from the people, so long the Priests could, as they chose, keep the people in thraldom, and wield over them an unlimited, unquestioned authority.

And just so, since the Christian Dispensation, the times when the world has been in the most slavish bondage to Priestcraft have been the times when the

knowledge of the Word of God has gone most completely out of existence. The greatest ignorance, the greatest servitude, the greatest superstition, the greatest vice, the greatest misery, have prevailed in those periods when the light of Divine Truth was shut most completely from the people. What are called the Dark Ages, were simply the period of the world's deepest midnight in the occultation of the Word of God, the burying of it beneath the power of Priests and ordinances, and in times somewhat later, beneath the solemn shadow of magnificent cathedrals. The greatest priestly despotism, therefore, I say again, is not that where there is no revelation, but where the existing revelation is kept from the knowledge of all but the Priests themselves, so that under its pretended sanction they may make what laws they please for others, and lay what restrictions they please upon themselves. Just so, the most perfect civil despotism in the world would not be that where there is no constitution, but that where a constitution, the existence of which is admitted, is kept hidden from the people, and open to the knowledge and construction only of the rulers. Plainly, because in such a case the rulers can give the pretended sanction of the constitution to whatever freaks of despotism they may choose to enact.

One of the greatest safeguards against a despotism in these United States, and against abuses in the government, would be the perfect knowledge of the constitution by all the people, a perfect acquaintance with all its provisions, with all their own privileges guaranteed by it, and with all the powers of the government, in all their extent and limits, so as to leave just

as little as possible to be defined by the rulers or the judges, and no prerogatives so uncertain as to be subject to definition by those who exercise them, or given up to the explanation of the powers that be. The liberty of the people is gone, as soon as the constitution is so hidden from them, or so retained in the knowledge of the government only, as that those who administer it may go beyond its authority, and yet successfully pretend the sanction of that authority. Let this once be the case, and opinion, property, and life itself, are no longer safe from governmental usurpation. There is always danger that men in power will always be tyrants, so far as they can be. Hence it were well, if the Constitution of the United States were made a school-book, as well as the Bible, which is the constitution of our religious liberty and happiness; for the knowledge of the first tends to preserve us from the encroachments of our civil rulers, as the knowledge of the other from the tyranny of spiritual guides. Just as it is with the knowledge of the Constitution, it is with the knowledge of the Bible. Conceal that from the people, and you give unlimited power to the Priests; you make inevitably an Ecclesiastical Despotism; you make it the worse tyranny a thousand times, because, in your ignorance of the Bible, its usurpations can pretend to the sanctions of the Bible; and when you add to this the indefinable, invisible, mysterious, omnipotent sanction of the traditions of an infallible Church, you have the most tremendous despotism that can possibly be conceived. Your Priests may mould the people like wax, for they have the power of superstition to work by; since the sense of religion and the sanctions of a

revelation always pass into superstition, so soon as the knowledge of that revelation is taken away.

IGNORANCE THE MOTHER OF SUPERSTITION.

It has been coined as one of the great lies of Infidelity and Atheism, that Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion. The truth is, that Ignorance is the Mother of Superstition, and where there is not an intelligent devotion, founded on the people's acquaintance with the Word of God, there will always be an immeasurable fund of superstition passed over to the power of the Priests for them to work upon at their pleasure. This is the secret of the illimitable despotism, which the Romish Priests have always exerted over their subjects. It can be maintained only by keeping their subjects in profound ignorance of God's Word. Hence their hostility against the Scriptures. While the Word of God is concealed, they can fill the spiritual world with whatever shapes of terror they please to evoke from its darkness to the affrighted conscience. They let down the curtain of their own traditions over the nature of that spiritual world as God has revealed it, and of our duties in regard to it, and then filling that curtain with curious and awful paintings addressed to the superstitious vision of ignorant minds, they have lighted up behind it the fires of their own kindling, to terrify and subdue the world by the moving phantasmagoria of shapes which the genius of superstition has invented. They have turned out from the temple of God the beautiful and winning forms of religious truth, and have set in play the whole machinery against which the prophetic apostle so early

warned the Church under the titles of voluntary humilities, and worshipping of angels, seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils. Many times in the world's history has the world's superstitious vision been crowded with such supernatural terrors. The world's Priests have been the world's Magicians, with all the shoals and armies of evil spirits and dark miracles at their command. But when the Word of God rises on the world's darkness, then the air is freed from those shapes, that in the midnight of the mind have brooded at the altar, and watched at men's doorposts, and weighed like death upon the world's intellect. In the language of Milton, describing the conquest of the demons by the Babe of Bethlehem,

> The flocking shadows pale
> Troop to th' infernal jail;
> Each fetter'd ghost slips to his several grave.

So, when the Word of God broke upon the world in the Reformation, there was a renewal of that exorcism of devils, which took place at the coming of Christ, from Pagan oracles and altars. The secrets of Popish superstition were unveiled, and the Flamens or Priests of Romanism trembled in the midst of services as quaint and unchristian as those of Paganism itself.

> The oracles are dumb,
> No voice or hideous hum
> Runs through the arched roof in words deceiving.
> Apollo from his shrine,
> Can no more divine,
> With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving,
> No nightly trance, or breathed spell,
> Inspires the pale-eyed priest from the prophetic cell.

In consecrated earth,
And on the holy hearth,
The Lars and Lemures moan with midnight plaint;
In urns and altars round
A drear and dying sound
Affrights the Flamens at their service quaint;
And the chill marble seems to sweat,
While each peculiar power foregoes his wonted seat.

Over a great part of the Christian world there was such a dispossession of the dark genii of Romanism out of their haunts, when the Bible was reinstated on its throne in men's hearts and minds, as at the Reformation. In the new worship of traditions, temples and ordinances, now so rife in some directions, these exorcised spirits seem to be stealthily trooping back to their abodes. Nor is it an easy matter for such a system, or for those who serve under and uphold such a system, to relinquish the wielding of so tremendous a power as it has exercised, or to lay bare the secrets by which it is maintained. To the light of God's Word they will not come, lest their deeds should be made manifest, that they are not wrought in God.

UNDENIABLENESS OF THE FACT OF ROMISH OPPOSITION TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

In regard to the characteristic features of Romanism in past times, I am speaking the language of authentic, undeniable, universal history; and in regard to what Romanism now is, in the countries that have been longest under its sway, I speak not only from history and the records of others, but from my own personal observation and experience. Opposition to the Word

of God always has been, and now is, a marked characteristic of Romanism, the world over. It has never been concealed, and it is only in Protestant countries, and out of a compelled regard to Protestant public opinion, that Romanism has ever pretended to any willingness whatever to give the Scriptures to the people. The canons of the Church are against it, and the present manifestations of Romanism speak the same opposition. When Mr. Borrow was distributing the Bible in Spain, he was imprisoned, and threatened with death; and the prime minister of the kingdom told him distinctly that the Church forbade the circulation of the Scriptures. I had myself some little personal experience in Spain, at the same time when Mr. Borrow was there, of the hostility of the Romish clergy against the Bible for the people. In our own country there has been something of the same demonstration; nor can the genuine system of Romanism any better stand against the Bible in this country, than it can anywhere else. Assuredly, the burning of two hundred Bibles in the State of New York tells the same story that an *Auto da fé* for the Scriptures tells in Spain or Asia Minor.

NATURE OF THE "DOUAY VERSION."

But perhaps you will say that in this country and in England, the laity of the Romish Church are permitted the use of the Scriptures in their vernacular tongue. Three points are to be remarked in regard to this. First, it is only under favor of a license from the priest that they are thus permitted to peruse the Scriptures, and not as the Christian's BIRTHRIGHT. Second, the Bible which they use is not a translation from the ori-

ginal Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, but the translation of a translation, a translation from the Latin Vulgate. Third, by the addition of the Apocrypha, together with certain wrong translations, and Romish commentaries throughout, the Scriptures so circulated are made to interweave into their texture, with the most subtle ingenuity, some of the greatest errors on which the Romish system is grounded. What God intended as the medicine of the soul becomes its poison, and the Saviour's words are realized, "Ye have made the Word of God of none effect by your tradition."

The divine commandment of *repentance*, for example, a work which, rightly performed, destroys the whole Romish system of merits, is changed into the perversion to *do penance*. "And I say," remarked Dr. Bacon, "in the face of every man who understands the Greek alphabet, that the Papist, when he thus translates the New Testament command of repentance, *knows* that he falsifies the Word of God. He knows, if he knows the simplest elements of the language in which it was written, that it does not mean *do penance* any more than it means the greatest absurdity that could be put upon the sacred pages." And yet this is one of the poisonous substitutes it proposes to the soul burdened with the inquiry, "What must I do to be saved?" Again, it translates the 21st verse of the 11th chapter of Hebrews, to assert that Jacob, when he was dying, *adored the top of his rod*, and out of this blasphemous perversion it gathers a sanction for the whole usage of the Romish Church in the idolatrous worship of images and relics. Thus, when the children of that system ask for bread, it gives them a stone, and when they would have meat, it offers them scorpions and serpents.

THE SAME OPPOSITION ALL THE WORLD OVER.

Now I might pass in survey, did time permit, the various Roman Catholic countries in the world, and demonstrate the present hostility of Romanism to God's Word in every one of them; and I might show you in consequence the disastrous results to the liberty and happiness of the people in the exclusion of God's Word from their education, from their families, from their firesides, from their public and private existence. The mind of nations, as of individuals, withers and passes into bondage when deprived of the invigorating aliment of Divine Truth. In the Old World I have seen this, as plainly as ever I beheld a building in ruins. It would take many an evening to trace the hostility to God's Word, the profound ignorance of it, and the consequent degradation and misery resulting, in Spain, in Italy, in Malta, in Sicily, in Portugal, in Greece, in Asia Minor, in Ireland, in South Ameirca. So successful and so disastrous has been the long-continued opposition of Romanism to the Scriptures, that the very conscience of the people has been suborned in its service, and seared against them. Romanism has succeeded in making it a matter of conscience with the people not to read the Bible. It would be a terrible revelation of the power and wickedness of this Mystery of Iniquity, if you could see in what multitudes of minds, trembling under the despotism of the Church, the ordinary perusal of the Scriptures has come to be considered a mark of heresy, and an act of impiety!

THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS.

Here belongs some additional notice of the attempted exclusion of the Bible from the public schools in this city. In spite of the admirable report of the School Commissioners in answer to the absurd charge that the Bible, as a school-book, is sectarian (the plea under which the Romanists would have excluded it), there are still several large public schools in this city into which the Bible is not permitted to enter, and that, in some cases, notwithstanding the instructions and recommendations of the Board of Commissioners to the contrary. We hope this banishment of the Scriptures will no longer in any case be suffered. The Roman Catholics may banish it as sternly as they please from their own schools and families; they are at perfect liberty so to do; but let it not, in any case whatever, out of regard to their hostility against it, be excluded from the public school system of the city. It would be a shame to the name of Protestant. What, it may be asked, is to make us freer, better, happier than the rest of the world, if it be not the Word of God? What shall raise us above other nations, if it be not a baptism into that Word, an engirding of our souls with its panoply, a surrounding of our institutions with its atmosphere of light? What, all the world over, is the cause of the ignorance, degradation, and misery marking those countries, which, when the light of Reformation raised Protestant nations to liberty and happiness, remained beneath the system of the Papal Despotism? It is the absence of the Word of God, and the presence, in its stead, and the power, and the slavery, of debasing mummeries and superstitions; a bondage to rites, made to constitute, at

the will of the Priest, the only channels of Salvation; an education of intellectual servitude, without one element of spiritual freedom in God's word mingled with it.

The Bible is beyond all controversy the best book of education in the world. It is the best book for the formation of children's minds, the best book for their acquisition and preservation of a pure idiomatic style in their native language, the best book to promote and secure the purposes of family government, the best book to make our children enlightened and good citizens of the republic, the best book, in fine, to preserve them from all evil, and train them up in all good. A powerful volume might be written on its excellence as a school-book, and on the importance of still keeping it, where our forefathers laid it, as the corner stone of our invaluable system of public education. If you take it away, the system not only becomes worthless, but absolutely pernicious. Imbue a single rising generation with the various knowledges of our day, and leave out the knowledge and the fear of God in his Word, and you have already made broad provision for your country's ruin. You have gathered fuel of ambition and irreligion, which any bold mind may set fire to. If Lord Bacon could talk of knowledge alone, without the mingling of God's truth and love in it, as being a dangerous and pernicious aliment to older minds, much more is it dangerous and hurtful to the minds of children. Our education needs a religious element; for it is not education alone that will save us, but will merely train a skilful race of gladiators for the arena of political strife. The only source of that element is the Word of God. And if you take the Word of God from your common schools, you are teaching infidelity and practical athe-

ism to the whole nation. You are filling the mind with elements, that, without the safeguard of Divine Truth, are sure to become fiery, bitter, and poisonous.

I have spoken of the Bible as a model of style; it is pure, native, uncorrupted, idiomatic English. It is the best preservation of our language in all our literature. It has most of the old, honest, simple, vigorous, expressive Saxon, which is the main body of the excellence of our language. Amidst all the varying artificial fashions of the day, it is invaluable to be kept as a standard before the mind. Every one knows the influence of a constant daily model. There is nothing more to be relied upon for preserving our language from corruption, than a daily familiarity with its development in the Scriptures. I speak, of course, of our common, incomparable, English translation; the best translation of the Scriptures, doubtless, in the whole world. Keep the minds of our children familiar with that, and the good old Saxon elements of thought and language will characterize their development.

In its general influence over the minds of our children and over the whole business of education, the Bible in our schools is invaluable. It is as a shower of the dews of divine grace and truth distilling into the susceptible minds of the young in the opening of each day, before the tender leaflets and petals of the flower have been exposed to other influences. It is a constant, habitual nourishment, an uninterrupted, systematic influence, as steady, as cheerful, as healthful as the light of the sun. It is a daily, unobtrusive imbuing of the mind with the sweet lessons of the Bible, to which the whole school reverently attend. In this way a great many children are blessed with the privilege of listening

daily to the Word of God, who, alas, would never hear it read in the family; and this is one of the most important reasons for maintaining it. It brings the children even of the abandoned, the vicious, the worthless—of families where no family altar was ever dreamed of—to the daily recognition of a heavenly Father, and the daily table of that Bread, which he has provided for the soul. How happy is its influence! At the opening of the school a divine shield thrown around the mind, to forestall the lessons of evil, and the presence of the powers of darkness; at the close of the day, a voice from heaven, and a sacred seal, to hallow and appropriate the useful knowledge imparted. How blessed an arrangement! This is acting somewhat in the spirit of the ancient heavenly precept. This is writing the characters of Heaven upon the soul deeper than all succeeding impressions. The powers of evil may take your child's mind, and inscribe upon it the names of demons, and the lessons of black acts; but by and by, when the Holy Spirit comes, this demoniac painting shall be taken off, and then, clear, deep, lustrous, those blessed early lines of truth, written on the heart, shall be made to burn, and shall become the means of eternal salvation!

THE HISTORICAL PROOF THAT ROMANISM, IN ITS GENUINE DEVELOPMENT, IS ANTI-REPUBLICAN.

VI. Side by side with the hostility of the Romish Church against the Bible must be placed the hostility of that Church as a Despotic Mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power, against the republicanism, the genuine freedom of the Bible. There is nothing but genuine

Christianity that can prepare a people for freedom, or enable them to sustain it. If the knowledge of the Word of God be shut out from the people, if the people are not made Christians, they are condemned to ignorance and timidity, and remain unprepared and unfitted to take any part in their own government; in a word, they remain simply to be governed by despots. Their rights are not regarded, their wishes are not consulted, their welfare is not sought after, they are merely the material of a despotic will, to be used and governed for the purposes of their masters. But where the Bible and its principles come, where its ideas of liberty imbue men's minds, and its ideas of morality prepare them for true liberty, then and there ensues a great change. The great Bible Truth of Justification by Faith carries in it the element and the essence of human freedom. When this truth gained a lodgment and a power in men's minds, then in the Middle Ages, and not till then, freedom, republicanism began to appear. And just so soon as it began to appear, the Despotism of Rome turned against it. Hence Guizot, in tracing the attempts at republican organization against the feudal system during the Middle Ages, has designated the infernal crusades against the Albigenses as the struggle of the Feudalism of the North against the attempt at democratic organization of the South. "Notwithstanding the efforts of southern patriotism," he says, "the North gained the day. This attempt at republican organization was put down, and the crusade reëstablished the feudal system in the south of France." That crusade, then, was the weight and malignity of the Papal Despotism, the power of the Romish Church, against one of the first attempts at republican freedom,

as well as against a reformed religion. In the same manner, wherever those attempts were made, the Romish Church bent herself against them. In tracing the endeavors of that Church to establish herself as a despotic theocracy, Guizot farther declares that "Europe is greatly indebted to the laic members of the feudal system in the eleventh century; the people were almost completely subjugated by the Church; sovereigns could scarcely protect themselves from its domination; the feudal nobility alone would never submit to its yoke, would never give way to the power of the clergy." Again he says, "During many centuries it was the lay aristocracy who maintained the independence of society with regard to the Church; they boldly defended it, when the sovereigns and the people were subdued." Thus it was continually the Romish Church against the liberties of the people.

THE ROMISH CHURCH AGAINST FRENCH FREEDOM.

And here I beg you to look at what Guizot calls the insurrection of the cities in the Middle Ages, their attempts after freedom, and inquire what part the Church acted in this struggle. It was against the freedom of the cities and the citizens. You will accept the testimony of Guizot as the historian of a point in this struggle, which I know not where to find illustrated elsewhere. "Some towns," he says, "the names of which are now almost forgotten, the little community of Vezelai in Nevers, for example, sustained against their lord a long and obstinate struggle. At length victory declared for the Abbot of Vezelai; upon the spot he ordered the demolition of the fortifications of the houses of the citizens; and the

names of many of the heroes, whose fortified houses were then destroyed, are still preserved." Guizot dwells upon the extraordinary mental timidity of the citizens; but he has failed to give its principal cause, their superstitious thraldom to the priests; it was the *habit* of thraldom, in that which constitutes the noblest part of man's nature, the thraldom of his inner, unseen being. If that be in fetters, you may be sure that what is seen of man will be under the fear of man still more. If what God only sees is governed by man, if God's power over the conscience is taken into man's hands, there is no longer any foundation for civil liberty. It was only when this thraldom was broken, that the cities became free, and republican ideas might grow out of them.

In all the history of the Middle Ages you may look in vain to find on the part of the Romish Church any other influence than that opposed to popular freedom. You may indeed find the Pope absolving subjects from their allegiance to kings, but this is only for the conquest of the kings, and not the deliverance of the people. The Church could, when occasion needed, by her tremendous machinery of excommunication, with its combined spiritual and secular terrors, play the people against the king, or the king against the people, but it was never for the good of either, always for the purpose of tyrannizing over both. As to the form of civil government, the clergy were always in favor of the most absolute monarchy; they themselves sought to establish an absolute religious monarchy over all mankind. The French historian to whom I have referred is always desirous to discover whatever element of good there was in the Middle Ages for civilisation to grow upon. He observes that the Romish Church un-

dertook the government of liberty of thought, proscribed individual opinion, made it in itself heresy, and utterly condemned the right of free inquiry. And yet he says that in the discussion of these questions, that is, the questions whether men should be allowed to have any liberty, there was great liberty and reason. That is, there was great liberty among an assembly of despots, in consulting what they should do with their slaves and victims. The supporters and advocates of tyranny bandy hard words and arguments against one another, and this is an example of great freedom of discussion! It were just as proper to boast of the spirit of free inquiry among an assembly of inquisitors, who fall into a severe and angry dispute whether a quick or a slow fire shall consume their prisoners. Bishop Hughes may find plenty of such republicanism as this in the Romish Councils of the Middle Ages.

THE ROMISH CHURCH AGAINST SWISS FREEDOM.

In the history of the Swiss confederacy, the most remarkable example of freedom during the Middle Ages, you may find as striking an instance of the part played by the Romish Church against the liberties of the people, as in the history of the rise of the free cities. Over the Canton of Appenzell in Switzerland an Ecclesiastic of the Romish Hierarchy, an Abbot, who possessed the rights of sovereignty, exercised them with such tyranny, that the inhabitants were compelled to a revolt. The despotic power of Austria came in to assist the Abbot against the Appenzellers, but they fought themselves free, and in 1408, about a century after the period, when the Swiss, with William Tell, began their resistance to the Austrian despotism, the

Canton of Appenzell was received as the ninth member of the Swiss confederacy. This forms a striking testimony as to the habit of the Romish Church to favor despotism.

CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE EMPERORS AND POPES.

In the history of the Italian republics you may likewise trace the influence of the Papal Power against human liberty. You will find, in the conflicts between the Ghibellines and the Guelphs, that is, in general, between the Emperors and the Popes, on the one hand the Emperors seeking to conquer Italy and reduce the authority of the Popes; on the other, the Popes seeking to subdue and control the temporal powers, and for this purpose taking part with the cities and republics against the Emperors. In the history of Frederic Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany, and of Frederic the Second, from 1150 to 1250, you will find the Imperial power perpetually in conflict with the Papal power, during the period when that power was making its most extraordinary advances, and threatening to subdue the world; the period when the Inquisition and the Crusade against the Albigenses taught mankind that of the two forms of despotism the Papal and Hierarchical was indescribably more hideous, more disastrous to all liberty, and more to be dreaded, than the Imperial. In the history of the Italian republics the Ghibellines are not always to be found on the side of the Emperors, nor the Guelphs on the side of the Popes. The Republic of Venice, for example, in 1177, took the part of Pope Alexander the Third, against Frederic Barbarossa; but in 1309, Pope Cle-

ment the Fifth, having asserted possession of the city of Ferrara, the Venetian republic opposed him. A Papal bull of excommunication was in consequence issued against the Venetians, the result of which was a dreadful revolution among that superstitious people, in which they themselves were defeated, and the most aristocratic despotism established over them that the world ever saw. So in the history of the Republic of Florence, at one time probably the freest of all the Italian republics, Pope Boniface the Eighth, being appealed to by the Guelph party as their protector, tempted Charles of Valois to come into Italy with an army, intending by his help to overcome the Ghibellines, to conquer the kingdom of Sicily, and to restore peace to the Florentine city. Charles having got possession of Florence, there ensued a scene of fire and pillage, rapacity and torture, for five months, this being the blessedness of the Pope's interference. But about the year 1303, you find the Cardinal de Prato under Pope Benedict the Eleventh, inviting the Ghibellines to attack Florence, although in general they were regarded as the Pope's enemies. The Popes were afraid of having their own power humbled by the Ghibellines, and therefore sided against them with the Guelphs. Pope Urban the Fifth, about the year 1375, excommunicated the Visconti, reigning lords of Milan, who were endeavoring to extend their power. Barnabas Visconti, having received the Pope's bull from the two legates by whom it had been sent, instead of being terrified thereby, is said to have compelled the legates on the spot to eat up the parchment on which the bull was written, together with the leaden seals and silken strings by which it was fastened. The Pope's bulls

were always hard of digestion; but at this time as to personal despotism, the Visconti, it must be confessed, were in Milan worse tyrants than the Pope in Rome. Afterwards, as we have seen, the Pope in Rome became the perfection of human depravity.

REASONING IN A CIRCLE, ILLUSTRATED.

The declaration that the Papacy was a popular institution, the Pope an expression of the people's will, and the government of the Romish Church a teacher of elementary republicanism, is so astounding, that we hardly know what to make of it, or whence it came. It is no uncommon way of establishing a proposition, when men repeat their own assertions; and they sometimes do it so often, and the reiteration of opinion comes back from so many quarters, that they are fully persuaded the opinion itself is knowledge and absolute proof. It was partly in this way that the Popes established their dominion. It was much in the same way that the figment of the apostolical succession gained ground. We are told of a horseman who on one occasion lost his way, and made a complete circle; when the first round was finished, seeing the marks of a horse's hoofs, and never dreaming that they were those of his own beast, he rejoiced and said, This at least shows me that I am in some track; when the second circuit was finished, the signs of travel were doubled, and he said, Now surely I am in a beaten way; and with the conclusion of every round the marks increased, till he was certain he must be in some frequented thoroughfare, and approaching a

populous town; but all the while he was riding after his horse's tail, and deceived by the track of his own error. This is oftentimes the way in which men are deceived in regard to antiquity, and the claims set up of exclusive apostolicity; the hierarchical mountains reverberate the echo so loudly, that it seems as if many thousand voices bore witness. But the track of opinion is a circle that reverts upon itself; here are the Apostles' footsteps, say these men, when they are following nothing but their own horses' hoofs. Here is republicanism in the Middle Ages and the Romish Church, says Bishop Hughes, when he is but following the circle of his own footsteps in America. This is one way of reasoning in a circle.

CONTRAST BETWEEN REPUBLICANISM AND ROMANISM.

The only thing that wears even the shadow of a republican aspect in the Romish system, is the fact that the Pope at Rome may come from the lowest of the people. But the Pope governs with a power absolutely despotic, and is not himself in any sense chosen by the people, but by the college of Cardinals, whom he himself appoints. There is not only not the slightest element of republicanism in the Romish system, nor any affinity with it whatever, but the most decided hostility against it, both in form and spirit. The genius of republicanism is open and fearless, the genius of Romanism is artful and secret. The genius of republicanism is voluntary and flexile, the genius of Romanism is compulsory and rigid. The genius of republicanism is freedom of thought, the genius of Romanism is bondage of opinion. The genius of

republicanism is an appeal to the people, the genius of Romanism is an appeal to power. The genius of republicanism is to convince the judgment and persuade the mind, the genius of Romanism is to compel the judgment and overawe the mind. Republicanism says to the people, Think as you please, and speak what you think. Romanism says to the people, Think only as the Church thinks, and speak as the Priests bid you. Republicanism says to the people, Keep your minds open to the light, and your schools bright with historic and divine truth. Romanism says, Admit only Roman light, and keep your children out of the way especially of the Bible and Martin Luther. Republicanism never punishes opinion, Romanism shuts it up in the dungeon and burns it at the stake. Republicanism is a system of argument, Romanism a system of authority; the one is plain and simple, the other gorgeous and pretending. In fine, Republicanism in its perfection is perfect freedom, Romanism in its perfection is perfect despotism. The two systems in their genuine development are as wide asunder as the poles; the one has always promoted human liberty, the other has trodden it down and destroyed it.

THE ROMISH CHURCH AGAINST THE FREEDOM OF GERMANY AND THE NETHERLANDS.

Let us continue our illustrations a little farther from the Middle Ages. The conflicts of which I have spoken between Emperors and Popes became in those ages, as you will find in Guizot, Ranke, D'Aubigné and others, a conflict also between bishops and magistrates, between the

citizens contending for freedom, and their church lords contending for the consolidation of their tyranny. You have noted the examples of Vezelay in France, and of Appenzell in Switzerland. In Germany the conflict was, if possible, still more strenuous. The citizens of Frankfort, about the year 1329, were excommunicated for resisting, under their Margrave Louis, the encroachment of their church lords upon their liberties. They remained twenty-eight years in this state of excommunication, without masses, baptisms, marriage, or funeral rites; a most wonderful example of what an intrepid union could do against ecclesiastical despotism, in a favorable conjuncture, and in a country out of which the heart of freedom had not been utterly subdued and eaten by the gangrene of superstition. Pursue the history of Germany down into the period of the Reformation, and the conflict between the people for their liberties, and the Pope and the Romish clergy for the right of despotism over them, becomes more marked and universal. You see the peasantry themselves forming leagues against their oppressors, and learning the elements of republicanism out of the conflicts into which they were compelled against despotism. Tracing the Reformation in Switzerland, you find in the history of Zurich and Geneva the same conflict of the Romish Church and the Papal power against liberty. Tracing the history of despotism in the Netherlands, it is the union of Church and State tyranny, the union of the Romish Church with the Spanish monarchy, running a career of oppression and cruelty, such as the annals of the world present no other example of, except it be the exterminating crusade of Rome against the Albigenses. Philip the Second was the kingly incarnation of the ferocity of the Inquisi-

tion, the bigotry of the Church, the despotism of the Pope, and the tyranny of the Absolute Monarch, all in one. In his butchery of the inhabitants of the Low Countries, he and the Duke of Alva, and Pope Pius the Fifth, were of one heart and one mind, three of the sternest, most remorseless bigots the world ever saw, or ever can see. The same Pope, in the same spirit, fighting against the Protestants in France, issued to the leader of his troops the unexampled order, which might have come from an incarnate demon, to "take no Huguenot prisoner, but instantly to kill every heretic that might fall into his hands." It was against such a despotism, that the Netherlands, driven into a revolt, fighting for liberty, and determined to suffer the loss of everything rather than the loss of the Gospel, at length achieved, though against such desperate odds, their national independence.

THE ROMISH CHURCH AGAINST ITALIAN FREEDOM.

The same unceasing opposition to liberty marks the administration of the Romish Church in Italy, perhaps the worst governed country in the whole world. Whenever, in the period we are reviewing, there was any effort on the part of any place of importance, for the defence of its privileges, the Government seized the opportunity of such incidents "for annihilating the privileges of towns, which still possessed important remains of their former freedom, and for reducing them to complete subjection." In the case of Ancona, Pope Clement the Seventh created such an opportunity by his own stratagems, and then utterly abolished and destroyed the freedom of the city. In much the same

way Pope Paul the Third destroyed the ancient liberties of the city of Perugia. He raised the price of salt by one-half, and this act of despotism being resisted by the Perugians on the ground of their ancient privileges, the Pope excommunicated the people, brought an army against them, and in 1540 compelled the city to surrender, stripped it of all its privileges, and made its delegates, with halters round their necks, implore pardon, kneeling at the Pope's toe. And this is the Republicanism of the Romish Church. "The Papal authority," says Ranke, "in the States of the Church was incalculably augmented by these repeated and successful blows; neither the towns nor the barons ventured any longer to offer resistance; one after another the free communities submitted, and the Pope was able to dispose of all the resources of the country, for the attainment of his objects."

Now if, in addition to all this, you desire in one sentence the policy of such republicanism unveiled to you, and the ideas formed in regard to the nature of government, by such an ecclesiastical system, you may have your wish gratified from the administration of Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, so late even in the time of the Reformation, as the year 1575. Government was regarded as the despotic mastery of the people to the ruler's will; the maxim, divide and conquer, was applauded; and all means were considered justifiable, which took all freedom from the people, and left it at the mercy of the ruler's will. In the report of a president of Romagna to Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, I find, says the historian Ranke, these words: "*The business of governing is difficult, where the people hold well together; when divided, they are easily mastered.*"

I say, for one, Bishop Hughes may carry such republicanism as this back where it came from, to Rome. There let it stay; but we trust in God the time is not far distant, when in poor, oppressed, misgoverned Italy, this wretched despotism shall come to an end, and its place be supplied by a liberty, both civil and religious, like our own.

THE AUSTRIAN GOVERNMENT AS A RESULT OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

So far as modern institutions can be traced to the Middle Ages for their origin, I think we may find a full and fair example of the kind of republicanism which might spring out of the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power in those ages, in the present despotic government of Austria. I was once travelling through the city of Innspruck in a time of perfect peace, and, like a simple republican, not having the fear of the Austrian soldiery before my eyes, I set out to cross the public square in a certain direction, when a soldier stopped me, and without saying a single word, pointed to the cannon across the mouth of which I was for taking a short cut of personal freedom. Doubtless they were loaded, and there they stand to guard that public square night and day, though for what purpose I could not conceive, except this, that that square was too tempting and convenient a place for a public assembly of the people. Next to the standing army of the Pope of Rome, I think that those cannon and that soldiery are the best hieroglyphics of the kind of Republicanism which the mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power will teach you, if you go for instruction into the Middle

Ages. The clearest, most decided element that has come down from them is that of absolute monarchy. You might as well go into the dungeons of the Inquisition to find our freedom of religious faith and worship, as into the governments of the Middle Ages, and especially the Papacy, to find the elements of our republicanism.

THE TRUE ORIGIN OF REPUBLICAN FREEDOM, AND ITS PROGRESS WESTWARD.

As to discover the elements of a pure Christianity we have to take a sweep of more than fifteen hundred years, clear across the Middle and Dark Ages, beyond the existence of the Papacy, and beyond the corruptions of the Christian Church, so, to find the elements of a pure republicanism, we have to sweep across all the institutions and governments of the world for as many centuries, and to set ourselves down in the heart of republican Greece. Go with me to the Acropolis at Athens, and there, beneath that sky of such animating purity and beauty, standing at the foot of the Parthenon, venerable and melancholy in its ruins, and watching the golden light of the setting sun, as it steeps the marble in its rosy coloring, and kisses the mountain tops of Hymettus, and mantles the Egean sea, we will remember how the sun of republican liberty, as it sank from the sight of the Grecians, went westward in its course; through storms and darkness it struggled indeed for a season, till it broke upon the Puritans in the British Parliment, and having filled the souls of Pym and Hampden and Algernon Sidney with the never-to-

be-forgotten vision, and having lighted up in them the unextinguishable, undying flame of liberty, passed into a cloudless sky in this Western Continent, the last refuge of freedom for mankind, here to be stayed in its course, till Washington, by its unfaltering light, could fight out the battle with the tyrants of the world; could finish and perfect for all mankind, and for all ages, the model of a republican liberty; a model, we have reason to believe, as pure and perfect as our fallen state is capable of, and fitted to receive and sustain the long exiled and forgotten genius of a Primitive Scriptural and not Hierarchical Christianity.

For it is from none other than the deep fountains of civil liberty in Greece that we draw our inspiration; we stay not in the Middle Ages; we find not our sources of life in the Roman Empire; but those antique fountains, covered with sere leaves, and choked in their native region for ages, have run under ground, beneath the rubbish of Roman, of Papal, of Monkish, of Monarchical Despotism, beneath the ruins of Empires, and the rising piles of Cathedrals, yea, beneath an ocean of anarchy and ignorance, to spring up in this continent, the same bright sparkling water, with the atmosphere of Scriptural truth around it, and the sun of God's grace shining upon it, for us to drink of. As the writings of Aristotle were hidden in a cellar, entombed as it were from the world for centuries, to rise again and keep the world for centuries in an intellectual bondage, so the precious remains of Grecian Antiquity in government and civil liberty were also concealed to give the world a second youth of freedom; concealed from an age in which the desperate corruptions of Christianity would have eaten them up, or rendered them a *caput mortuum*,

to rise again at a more favorable period, and along with the Scriptures, to help forward both the spiritual and intellectual deliverance and regeneration of the world.

DARKNESS OF THE PEOPLE DURING THE ABSENCE OF GREEK LITERATURE, AND OF GOD'S WORD.

For, mark you, all the while that the Papacy was gaining and consolidating its despotism, the world was enshrouded in darkness, a darkness which the Papal Church maintained for its own benefit, a darkness which concealed alike the elements of Grecian, Roman and Scriptural learning from the world. With the services of God's own worship concealed in a dead language, with the light of the Scriptures locked up under the Latin tongue, and that tongue itself so gone from men's knowledge at one period, that even the clergy scarcely knew or cared anything more of it than the people; so gone indeed, that even in England, after the presence of such minds as those of Bede and Alcuin, our admirable Alfred could not find a single Priest in the most enlightened part of England who could understandingly say his prayers, or could translate Latin into English; and so gone, that, even in Italy, in the tenth century, scarcely a single person was to be found in all Rome, who knew the first elements of letters;—with such deadly, universal, and almost inconceivable ignorance, what could be expected but priestcraft, despotism and death! Conceive, if you can, and contrast with your own state, amidst the light of God's Word, and of innumerable instructive human volumes, and of the daily press with its countless millions of issues, and of your open schools, with the Bible and every science taught

in them, and of your churches with their flood of heavenly light, conceive, if you can, the ignorance of those ages. The people had no books, not even a scrap of parchment with the name of God upon it; they knew not what prayer was; if they muttered it in the church forms, it was like an Arabic exorcism, and if they uttered an aspiration intelligibly, it was to the Virgin or the saints. If they took an oath, it was more solemn to swear upon dead men's bones than on the gospels. Read Thierry's interesting History of the Norman Conquest for a proof and vivid delineation both of the ignorance and oppression of the people, and the undisguised selfishness and tyranny of the priests, the Pope, and the whole compound of civil and ecclesiastical domination. Read Myconius' account as given in D'Aubigné, and compare it, if you will be curious, with the ecclesiastical pictures in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, the pardoner with his wallet "brimful of pardons come from Rome all hot," with his "gobbet of the sail of Saint Peter's fishing-smack,"

> He had a crois of laton full of stones,
> And in a glass he had a pigge's bones,

and with these relics he got more money out of the poor in one day than they could get by their wages in two months.

When I was visiting, in the city of Grenada in Spain, the Cathedral in which repose the bodies of Ferdinand and Isabella, the priest offered me, in a jewelled triangular frame, the handkerchief of the Virgin Mary that I might kiss it. I was also shown the identical sheet in which the body of Christ was wrapped when he was taken down from the Sepulchre! They averred that it had never been washed, a thing which was easily cred-

ited. But these were trifles in comparison with the wonders they could show in the Middle Ages. "At the Church of All Saints in Wittemberg was shown a fragment of Noah's Ark; some soot from the furnace of the three Children; a piece of wood from the crib of the infant Jesus." At Schaffhausen they beat this, for they showed the breath of St. Joseph that Nicodemus received on his glove! These things were the libraries of those days; it seems almost incredible to us; but even only half a century ago they showed to Mr. Beckford in one of the Cathedrals in Portugal, a feather that had dropped from the wing of the Archangel Gabriel in one of his visits to this world! These were the people's books in the Middle Ages.

SCHOOLS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

The schools, such as they were, in Cathedrals and monasteries, were not for the people, and for the clergy they were schools neither of true science nor religion. What, indeed, must they have been? The *trivium* and *quadrivium* may have been taught, and the forms of the Latin Missal, but of any knowledge that could emancipate the common mind, or give life to the soul, they were unequivocally destitute. I have been in countries, where I have visited schools, in which from morning till night, not one single thing was taught the children, but just to repeat over, like a parrot, in a language which they could not understand, sentences and pages, as meaningless to them, as the talismans inscribed upon the sword of Solomon, or as the *oneryeueryicheryaven* of the shouting school-boys in their play. That the schools of the Church, in those dark ages, were one particle better than this, for the common people, we have

yet to learn. In the eighth century, the best examples of benevolence and learning, and almost the only instances in all Europe, in which it seems to have been exerted for the good of the people, we find in the island of England, in the excellent persons of Aldhelm and Bede. Aldhelm turned his own skill in the use of the harp, and in ballad-making to accompany it, most happily for the good of the people. While he was Abbot of Malmsbury, finding the country people, who came to divine service, in a great hurry to get home without the sermon, he used to go and take his seat, with the harp in his hand, on the bridge over the Avon, and would offer to teach the art of singing. Here a crowd would gather around him, and when he had indulged their taste by some common song, he led them to more serious matters, and at length got them to singing the Psalms of David. This certainly shows a most benevolent and cheerful zeal for the good of the people, and a most rare and happy faculty of turning his peculiar knowledge of the common minstrelsy to their spiritual advantage.

But this was, so far as we know, a solitary example in the world; and indeed, for a season, what light and knowledge there was seemed to be hidden out of reach of the papacy in the British Isles. And you are to remember that the first benevolent efforts, in the dim foreshadowing of Common Schools in behalf of the people, came not from the Popes nor the despotic Church, but from the Monarch. Both Alfred and Charlemagne endeavored to establish schools, but the impulse was from another source than the corruptions of Christianity. And when, at a late period, and possibly as the result of these schools, there began to get abroad translations

of some portions of the Scriptures, the Church interposed to put her ban upon such translations, and to sacrifice the souls that possessed the living knowledge of them. And here let me add, that Hallam, who among other learned writers has drawn a picture, but not at all exaggerated, of this dreadful darkness, deliberately declares the monstrous falsehood, that "had religion been less pure, it would have been less permanent, and that Christianity has been preserved by means of its corruptions." If you wish for an amusing instance of absurd reasoning worthy of the darkness of the ages he is dwelling on, turn to that page in his ninth chapter, where he says that "Monasteries would probably have contributed very little towards the preservation of learning, if the Scriptures and the liturgy had been translated out of Latin when that language ceased to be intelligible. Every rational principle of religious worship called for such a change; but it would have been made at the expense of posterity. One might presume, if such refined conjectures were consistent with historical caution, that the more learned and sagacious ecclesiastics of those times, deploring the gradual corruption of the Latin tongue, and the danger of its absolute extinction, were induced to maintain it as a sacred language, and the depository, as it were, of that truth and that science, which would be lost in the barbarous dialects of the vulgar." One would almost be tempted to conjecture that Mr. Hallam interposed these sentences as an illustration of the darkness of the ages he is reasoning upon. But he must have forgotten likewise that it was not, after all, through the instrumentality of this Latin tongue, the tongue of the Church, that learning was really revived, but through the instrumentality

of the Greek Literature, restored from the forgetfulness of ages.

THE LATIN DISCIPLINE A MEANS OF DESPOTISM.

I have thought sometimes that God would not suffer that a language which a corrupt Church had chosen as the means of hiding knowledge from the people, should ever become the instrument of their renovation; and in point of fact He did not; for it was Greek, and not Latin, that delivered the world from bondage, and broke the night of her ignorance. And if the Papacy and the Romish Church had chosen the Greek original of the Scriptures, instead of the Latin Vulgate, for the language of her worship, I hesitate not to say that the power of the Papacy and the corruptions of the Church never could have risen to the height that they attained, and the world's emancipation would have taken place ages earlier than it did. Against the powerful spirit of thought and freedom in the Greek literature that would thus more or less have been familiar, the Papal Despotism could not have stood; for when that literature did come in contact with men's minds, it was like an electric shock upon the nations. Aristotle himself had been debased in Latin, and now not only Aristotle in the Greek, but a freer, nobler, happier spirit, even Plato's, walked abroad and held communion with the minds of scholars, and helped to deliver them from Aristotle's despotism.

Let it be remembered that I am not denying nor forgetting, that gigantic minds were reared under the Latin discipline; but I do deny that any really free minds were so reared. There was the great Thomas Aquinas, whom Sharon Turner has compared among

the schoolmen, to the snowy shoulders of Mont Blanc among the mountains; a most gigantic mind, unquestionably, but bound round by the icebergs of Aristotle and reflecting only his cold light, even as Mont Blanc himself is sheeted and glittering with ice and snow. When the practice of indulgences had been established, and the purchase of the pardon of sins, it was this philosopher whose theology added to its power. The doctrine already invented, was polished and perfected by Thomas Aquinas, "that there is an immense and inexhaustible treasure of works of supererogation performed by the Saints; that the guardian and dispenser of this treasure is the Roman Pontiff; that out of this plenteous stock he can transfer and assign to every man such a portion as his spiritual wants may require, and as shall suffice to secure him from the punishment due to his offences." So you perceive, that if for nothing but this cutting up by the roots and destroying of the great doctrine of Justification by Faith, this gigantic Schoolman was himself a slave to the Pontiff, and helped to enslave others also.

And here without going into Lord Bacon's most admirable and impartial survey of the merits and defects of the Schoolmen, I would refer you to Sharon Turner, in his History of England, for an easy examination of their best side, in extracts somewhat copious from their own pages. I would remind you at the same time that of no small proportion of the questions in Thomas Aquinas' Summa Theologiæ, such as the following are specimens:—Whether the fire of the last conflagration will be common terrestrial fire; whether after the resurrection there will be hair on the head and nails on the fingers; whether two or more angels

cun occupy the same point in space at the same moment, and whether an angel is conscious of his own existence. The philosophers dwelt among abstractions and despised the people; they followed the dancing marsh-lights of Alchemy and Astrology; and the men who, in the Middle Ages, were themselves madmen in pursuit of the Philosopher's Stone, insane in the subtlety of intellect upon absurd questions, imprisoned the great Roger Bacon for years in a monastery as a magician; Roger Bacon, almost the only man then in the world who calmly pursued the path of true wisdom. There was learning in the midst of this darkness, but no fruit from it for the good of the people; there was subtlety of intellect, but till the revival of Greek literature, and the appearance of Luther, no liberty nor life. The very liberty of scholars among themselves was persecuted. St. Bernard pursued the famous Abelard with the despotism of the Church before two Councils, for twenty years, and at length procured his condemnation. Roger Bacon, as I have said, was confined in prison, and Arnold of Villa Nova, and Peter of Padua, if they had not died most opportunely, would, by the Inquisition, have been put into the flames.

LEARNING OF THE SCHOOLMEN.

Let me give you a description, in the words of Roger Bacon himself, in the thirteenth century, of the learning of his own day. "Never," says he, "was there so great an appearance of wisdom, and so great ardor in study, in so many faculties, and so many countries, as during the last forty years; for doctors are scattered everywhere, in every city, in every castle, in every borough, students, principally under the two orders

(that is, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, who were almost the only people who pursued literature), which was never the case till within about forty years; and yet *never was there so great ignorance, and so great misapprehension.* The mass of students dose and yawn like asses over the bad translations (he means the books of Aristotle, the translations of which he would censure as being ridiculous and exceedingly faulty), and waste altogether the time, labor, and expense they lay out upon them. Appearances are all that engross their attention, and they care not what it is they know, but only to appear very learned before the senseless multitude." "If I had control," said he, "over these books of Aristotle (those Latin translations), I would cause them all to be burned, for it is a loss of time to study in them, and a cause of error, and a furtherance of ignorance, beyond what can well be expressed."

When learning was in such a state, it was in no condition to excite much jealousy on the part of the Romish Church. The theology of the Schoolmen might be correct in speculation, but being a dead theology, separated from life, a matter of curious and subtle speculation merely, it excited no apprehensions. So soon, however, as the spirit of life appeared in it, it roused all the enmity of Rome against it. You may take Wickliffe for an example, who, assuredly, if he had not had within his soul, and so within his speculations, the life of the Scriptures, would have made a great Schoolman, and been probably as great an authority among Romanists as Thomas Aquinas himself. But his very bones were so infected with heresy, that forty years after his death the Council of Constance had to dig them up and burn them. So, in 1498,

the eloquent, ardent, enthusiastic Savonarola, for his fearless preaching against the abuses of the times, was accused to the Pope, summoned to Rome, ordered to leave preaching, confronted by the Inquisitors, put to the rack, strangled, burned. Why Wesselius, who studied the Scriptures in their original languages, and disregarded all human authorities, and of whom Luther said, "If I had previously read Wessel, my enemies might have thought Luther derived all his views from Wessel, so perfectly accordant are the two in spirit," was suffered to die peaceably in 1489, it is difficult to say. Fifty years afterwards the persecution of those who held these sentiments had risen to such a height in Italy, that a writer of the times in that country declares "it is hardly possible for a man to be a Christian, and to die in his bed." A few years later still, a living science as well as a living theology became the object of jealousy and persecution to the Romish Church, and Giordano Bruno, a great philosopher in the sixteenth century, was burnt at Rome. Campanella suffered torture. Even in the seventeenth century Galileo narrowly escaped. The Romish Church made him deny the very laws of nature which he had developed; and you may be sure he rarely took up his telescope, or looked at the stars, but across the fires of the Inquisition. Speaking of the period when Bruno was burnt, the historian Ranke observes, that it was a time when the Italian mind manifested a noble tendency towards deep investigation, and held out promises of great discoveries. "But in the very nature of things the Romish Church could not encourage this freedom of thought; she had marked out a line which men were not to overstep, and wo to him who ventured to pass it."

COMPLETE DISSOLUTENESS OF THE CHURCH.

Nor did ever any amelioration or reformation of these evils come out of the Church herself, nor out of the flourishing period of learning and art in her centre. When the art of painting revived, and flourished with such astonishing splendor, it was no principle or element of Romanism that set it in motion, though it was the policy of Romanism to foster it for the gorgeousness and glory of the Church. In Italy, especially, during the revival of art and classical literature, the Romish Church was thoroughly and entirely a system of earthly policy, luxury, wealth and grandeur. Leo the Tenth was a Sybarite in literary luxury and refined sensuality and debauchery; and such as the head of the Church was, such was his court, such was all Italy. And yet, never was there such a period for the bloom of art in its consummate glory, for sculpture in its severest simplicity and grandeur, for architecture in its most gorgeous forms, for painting in the perfection of its beauty. But in literature there was nothing but imitation, nothing original, because there was nothing Scriptural, nothing Christian. The Classics were imitated, the Bible was rejected, the consequence was intellectual effeminacy and infidelity. "The common people," says Ranke, "sank into an almost Pagan superstition, and looked for salvation to mere ceremonial practices; the opinions of the upper classes were even of an anti-religious tendency. At the very moment that the offering of the Mass was finished, the Priests uttered words of blasphemy, which denied its efficacy. It was the tone of good society in Rome to question the evidences of Christianity." Guizot has

traced an admirable picture of the similarity between this luxury of literature and infidelity, and that which prevailed in France on the eve of the French Revolution. There was Pagan philosophy, Pagan art, and Pagan infidelity; but religion, through the influence of the Romish Church, had gone out of the Italian world.

ATTEMPT AT REFORMATION UNSUCCESSFUL.

After the death of Leo the Tenth, there was some attempt at Reformation, beginning under Pope Adrian. At one time there seemed to be the promise of a regeneration within the Romish Church itself, for the doctrines of Luther took fast hold of the minds of many, and became the opinions even of some of the Romish Cardinals. But the Council of Trent and the formation of the order of Jesuits soon put a stop to these tendencies towards regeneration. At first the Court of Rome dreaded nothing so much as a Council, because of the enormous abuses and corruptions in the Church. The value of the Pope's simoniacal stock diminished in the market the moment it was mentioned. "I find," says Ranke, "that at the first serious report of a Council, the price of all saleable offices in the Court fell considerably." But the Council of Trent acted at the Pope's pleasure, anathematized the Lutheran doctrines, and defended the hoary abuses of the Church. The order of the Jesuits sprang up, the Inquisition with all its horrors was established in 1542, a purgation of all Italy from the views of Luther commenced by fire, the celebrated and admirable book of an Italian on the "Benefits of the Death of Christ," was burned by thousands and exterminated. It was the reign of persecution and terror, for the Church would

not be reformed. The celebrated Machiavel had expressed himself twenty years before in the following terms: "The greatest prognostic of the approaching ruin of Christianity is to see that the nearer people are to Rome, which is the capital of Christianity, the less devotion they have. The scandalous examples, the crimes of the Court of Rome, have occasioned Italy to lose entirely every principle of piety, and every sentiment of religion."

And now let it be marked, that in the midst of all this corruption, it was a mercy to mankind that in the Papal Church itself there was no successful reformation. A great attempt was made, and in the first half of the fifteenth century was repeated in different Councils; but it was entirely unsuccessful; and it was pleasing to Divine Providence, and good for the world that it was so. For, had it succeeded, it would have been but partial, it would have left the world still in possession of the Papal Church, there would have been no Schism, no Protestant Church, no real reformation, and no liberty for the world; but the spirit of reform being pacified by the appearance of reform, the world would have gone on, how many ages longer we cannot tell; but certainly much longer beneath the awful, overwhelming, despotic unity of the Papal Church; and those pseudo-protestants, who at this day are lamenting with the Romanists over the unhappy Schism of the Lutheran Reformation, would in all likelihood have been saying Mass at Popish altars; or instead of enjoying a republican freedom in America, would have been grinding, with their eyes put out, in the mills or the prison-houses of despotism. The Lutheran Schism, as well as the Lutheran Reformation,

was the greatest blessing conferred in the fifteenth century upon the world. That broke the reign of spiritual despotism, when nothing else could.

In the period of the dog-days of that despotism, in the highest meaning which the terms will bear, says the author of "Ancient Christianity" and "Fanaticism," "the Romish tyranny was universal and absolute. Men could not think or inquire even concerning the processes of the material world, and the laws of matter and motion, without treading upon ground which the Church had pre-occupied; all philosophy was either orthodox or heterodox; and a man might be burned for an opinion in mechanics, as well as for an opinion in theology. There could be no possession or enjoyment of the goods of life, no marrying, no inheriting, no devising, no ruling, no judging, no speaking, no feeling, no thinking, there could be no living and no dying, without the leave of the Church, or apart from her favor."

OPINION OF SCHLEGEL AS TO THE ANTI-REPUBLICANISM OF POPERY.

I have said that the completest fruit which modern Europe has received from the Middle Ages is absolute monarchy, and have pointed you to the Austrian despotism as its most perfect form. Now as to the monarchical and anti-republican tendencies of Romanism, and I might add, of every form of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, we have the testimony of distinguished Roman Catholic writers in our own day, not to go back to any authorities of past times. You have all heard of the celebrated Frederick Schlegel, who, in 1828, delivered a course of lectures at Vienna, demonstrating

the mutual support which Popery and Monarchy derive from each other. The field was a wide and easy one to work in, and the more despotic the monarchy which he wished to be established, the more powerfully manifest could he make it, that Popery would be its grand support. Give us Church and State, he might say, with a Pope at the head of one, and an Emperor at the head of the other, and we will never fear the encroachments of too much liberty on our despotism. In these lectures the learned author represented Protestantism as the enemy of good government, the ally of republicanism, and the cause of all the disorders and distresses of Europe. Speaking of our own country he says, "The true nursery of all these destructive principles, the revolutionary school for France and the rest of Europe, has been North America. Thence the evil has spread over many other lands, either by natural contagion, or by arbitrary communication." In accordance with the doctrine of these lectures, the Leopold foundation, under the auspices of Prince Metternich, was set on foot to spread Romanism in this country, and thus prevent, modify, and ward off the intense energy of our republicanism, from which a despotic government like that of Austria has so much to fear. Now if you put Schlegel's opinions on the intimate connection between Popery and Monarchy along with Bishop Hughes' opinions as to the origin of republicanism in the Papal governments of the Middle Ages, it will not be difficult to determine which speaks the truth, nor to see the reason why in a country like Austria the genius of the Romish Church is not concealed, but is vaunted as the genius of monarchical power, while in this country the same Church is vaunted as the cradle of genuine republicanism.

THE TRUE REFORMATION.

While the unsuccessful attempt at reformation was making within the Papal Church, there was a reformation preparing and rolling onwards out of the Church, a reformation in souls anathematized by the Church, which God himself, by his own Spirit, would carry on to a great and perfect separation from that Church, in an obedience to his own command, Come out of her, my people! This reformation sprang from the Scriptures and the Spirit of God; the other attempt at reformation sprang from a desire to retain the power and the form of the Romish hierarchy. The true reformation began in the valleys of the Waldenses, and in the soul and the books and the preaching of John Wickliffe, and in the life, the piety, the martyrdom of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. All the power of the Romish hierarchy could not stop it. The Papal power itself, even while, at an earlier period, putting vast engines in motion for its own increase, had unconsciously put the causes in operation for its own downfall. The crusades, which tended in some respects to consolidate and strengthen the Papal despotism, prepared in other respects an era and influences to weaken and overthrow it. There are two facts which Guizot has noticed in the progress of the crusades, of great significance on this point. They advanced, through the influence of foreign travel, the general mind of Europe in its progress towards enlarged and liberal ideas, and though begun under the name and influence of religious belief, they deprived the religious superstition of its exclusive and despotic possession of the human mind. This result was entirely unforeseen, and so was the

second, which Guizot notices, and which was briefly this. Rome itself, the centre of the Church, but hitherto unknown to Europe, save by reverential worship and report, became a halting-place for a good portion of the crusaders, either going or returning. "A multitude of laymen were spectators of its policy and its manners, and were able to discover the share which personal interest had in religious disputes. There is no doubt that this newly acquired knowledge inspired many minds with a boldness hitherto unknown." The veil of superstitious reverence was taken off. What they saw, they *felt*, they thought upon; and though they dared not speak out, yet the sight, the thought, the feeling, worked afterwards as a leaven of contempt, opposition and emancipation. It was long in working, but sure, and mingled with the operation of many other causes.

EFFECT OF LUTHER'S VISIT TO ROME.

Now compare this effect upon the mind of Europe, with that produced two centuries afterwards upon the mind of Luther, by his visit to the Court of Rome. What Luther was in particular, the mind of Europe may be said to have been in general, in its discovery of the rottenness and wickedness of the Romish Hierarchy. This discovery, working first secretly in the general mind, found its vent in Luther; Luther was, if I may so speak, the Volcano, through which the ideas struggling and boiling in all Europe, rolling in repressed subterranean thunders, but as yet confined in depths, pent up in prison, at length poured themselves out, shot up into the air, in a stream of such fiery magnificence, that for a while the world stood still, and gazed

with awe upon the spectacle; the human mind was almost in terror at the sight of the elements of thought and freedom, which had broken from its own depths through the channel of that single mind, which God had chosen. It was the lava of Truth poured out through the mind of Luther as the crater; and if, as the Romanists say, it burned and devastated the world, it was because it was a world of error; and this lava of truth was to form, and did form, a soil of such deep, benignant strength and richness, as to cover the earth with a wilderness of fruits, and a mantle of verdure, such as had not clothed it for fifteen centuries.

DANTE, CHAUCER, AND WICKLIFFE.

The revival of genius in the Middle Ages seems to have borne an exact proportion to the degree of discernment of the abuses in the Church and in the Papal Despotism. Dante, Chaucer, and Wickliffe are remarkable examples. I place these three names together, because, though Wickliffe never, that I am aware of, wrote a line of poetry, they all three possessed kindred qualities of genius, and saw with a clear eye the iniquities of the Romish Church. The intrepidity and power of Wickliffe as a Reformer you know full well. The Poet Dante possessed an intrepidity of spirit not inferior to Wickliffe's; but writing nearly a century earlier, and in a country where the hand of the Papal power could more easily have reached him, had he been as plain and direct as Wickliffe, he would doubtless have been burned. The Poet Chaucer possessed neither the energetic will, nor the natural intrepidity of Dante, nor the moral courage of Wickliffe, and yet his poetry is so full of satire on the vices of the clergy, and

he sided so clearly with the party of Wickliffe, that we almost always think of him in connection with the Reformer. Read in the prologue to the Canterbury Tales Chaucer's descriptions of the Abbot, the Monk, the Friar, the Prioress, the Pardoner, the Sompnour and other Ecclesiastics, and all the Church population of the day are crowding around you. There is only one among them, the country parson, that has a spark of religion, and this picture was doubtless drawn from the real life of Chaucer's friend, the Reformer, John Wickliffe.

Dante, writing before either of them, depicted in burning language the corruptions of the Court of Rome, the pride, ambition and luxury of the Romish Clergy. In the nineteenth canto of the Inferno he put Pope Nicholas the Third in Hell, with others, his predecessors in the guilt of simony. He made him predict also the coming of Boniface the Eighth, and of Clement the Fifth, into the infernal torments of the damned. "Your avarice," said the poet, speaking to the tortured Pontiff,

> "Your avarice
> O'ercasts the world with mourning, under foot
> Treading the good, and raising bad men up.
> Of shepherds like to you, th' Evangelist
> Was 'ware, when her, who sits upon the waves,
> With kings in fornication he beheld."

In the twenty-seventh canto of the Paradise, he makes St. Peter rebuke and satirize his successors, declaring that they had used his keys for the purposes of war, and himself for such a seal,

> "Set upon sold and lying privileges,"

as made him turn red for shame and anger.

> "In shepherd's clothing, greedy wolves below
> Range wide o'er all the pastures!"

In the thirty-second and thirty-third cantos of the Purgatory, he draws a picture of the Church under Boniface the Eighth, as a harlot, and predicts the opposition of the Emperor of Germany to the usurpations of the Pope. Dante himself was of the party of the Ghibellines, and strong in his opinions in behalf of the Emperor's supremacy. Petrarch was another Italian poet of the fourteenth century, whose letters are filled with the most pointed reproaches of the tyranny and luxury of the Romish Church. Dante, Chaucer, and Petrarch were all of them great poets in their native language, in spite of the tendencies of the Romish Church of their day to repress all poetry, and confine all literature as well as religion to an unknown tongue. Wickliffe also wrote in his native language, that he might do what piety in the Romish Church had never done, *reach the heart of the people.* If the dominion of the Romish Church, as in their age, had continued, it may be doubted whether there would now have been a single nation in modern Europe possessed of a vernacular literature. For centuries longer the mind of the people would have been kept shrouded in darkness, and the truths of religion itself would have continued locked up in an unknown tongue. It was doubtless partly because the speculative truths contained in the writings of the Schoolmen were so locked up, that they were permitted to pass without the ordeal of fire, by the Romish See. They gained no access to the common mind, deprived no altars of their superstitious devotees, drew off no worshippers from the Virgin Mary, let in no light that could expose the wickedness

of the Papal pretensions; nay, as we have seen in the case of Thomas Aquinas, they were mingled with superstitious doctrines that went powerfully to the support of those pretensions. So the truth itself could pass unnoticed, so long as there was so much useful poisonous chaff mingled with it.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE DOCTRINE OF A SACRIFICIAL PRIESTHOOD.

VII. The seventh point in our historical argument developing the origin, progress, and support of the Hierarchical Despotism is the change of the ministry of the Church into a sacrificial Priesthood, and the monstrous abuse and subjection of the human mind to the grossest superstition in the idea that absolution for sin could be purchased from that Priesthood by penance and money. The Romish sacrifice of the Mass is the utter destruction of Christianity. It is the most blasphemous intrusion upon the prerogatives of God, for men to say that they offer up anew in sacrifice for sin the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed, the mind shrinks back in every direction, from the blasphemies connected with the doctrine of the Mass sacrifice. Under the Christian system there are no Priests, because, under the Christian system there are no sacrifices; they are for ever done away in the offering up by the Lord Jesus Christ of himself without spot to God; "nor yet that he should offer himself often, but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." But the Romish system hath its *Priests*, who sacrifice daily for the sins of the people, and who (most dread-

ful blasphemy) pretend to offer up in sacrifice the very body and blood of the Saviour!

This tenet, wherever it is believed, adds immeasurably to the power of the Priesthood, and is a mighty support of the Hierarchical system. Masses are efficacious for souls; Masses sacrifice men out of purgatory into heaven; Masses are in the power of the Priests; Masses can be purchased for money; Masses put the bodies, souls, and worldly goods of the people in the power and at the disposal of the Romish Priesthood. Tremendous dogma in the era of its power! Tremendous weapon still, and machinery of despotism, even in countries where Scriptural light and knowledge have shorn it of its omnipotence! Most dreadful also is this perversion of Christianity, in destroying the true doctrine of the atonement, in preventing the soul from resting intelligently for salvation upon the atoning sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, yea, in preventing almost the possibility of any true idea of Jesus as a Saviour. To the multitude, the Romish system has no Saviour; it has a sacrifice of the Mass, and a Virgin Mary, but the Saviour of the Gospel is not there; the soul does not rest upon him; how should it, when it cannot see him, for the crowd of mediators and intercessors thronging between the soul and God!

PRIESTLY ABSOLUTION AND THE CONFESSIONAL.

As the doctrine of a Priesthood destroys the Christian ministry, and of a daily sacrifice the Christian atonement, so the doctrine of absolution from sin purchasable by penance and money, destroys the doctrine of Justification by Faith. It puts into the hands of the priests an element of despotic power over the con-

science, which, so long as the ability to forgive sins is supposed to rest with the priests, is absolutely illimitable. Here, in this corruption, you well know, was the point where Luther commenced his mighty and successful war against the Papal despotism. Here, in this corruption is the grand secret of the power of the Romish priests in this country over the votaries of Romanism. Here is one grand reason for their jealousy against the Scriptures, and the secret, also, of their abhorrence of the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith. It cuts up their despotism by the roots, and cuts loose the people completely from despotic power. There is nothing else needed to subdue and annihilate the whole system of Romish abuses, but the full energy of this mighty truth.

The machinery of the confessional comes into view, under this head, as a powerful support of the Romish despotism, but I shall not dwell upon it, nor upon the terrific shamelessness, the corrupting faith, the indescribable *bestiality* of its theology. I will only call your attention to that tremendous image, so hideously appropriate to the subject, which the author of Fanaticism makes use of at the close of one of his chapters. What, he asks, after a while, must the receptacle become, into which the continual droppings of all the iniquities of a parish are falling, and through which the copious abomination filters? "It is hard to suppose that the Romish Church, in constituting her hierarchy, had wittingly kept in view the purpose of rendering her clergy the fit instruments of whatever atrocity her occasions might demand them to perpetrate; and so had brought to bear upon their hearts every possible power of corruption. Not content with cash-

iering them of all sanatory domestic influences, she has, by the practice of confession, made the full stream of human crime and corruption to pass, foul and infectious, through their bosoms! Having to construct at discretion the polity of the nations, the Church architects have so planned it, as that the sacerdotal order should constitute the *cloacæ* of the social edifice; and thus have secured for Rome the honor of being, through these channels, the great stercorary of the world! How fitly, in the language of prophetic vision, is the apostate Church designated, sitting as she does at the centre of the common drainage of Europe, as the Mother of Abominations, and as holding forth in shameless arrogance, the cup of the filthiness of her fornications!"

CONCLUSION.

VIII. There remains now but one point in our historical argument to take up, which is the nature, power, and authority of the Canon Law, as an enshrinement and support of the abuses of the Church and the despotism of the Hierarchy, up to the sixteenth century. The discussion of this topic must necessarily be deferred to another lecture. I shall dispose of it briefly, and then pass to consider the fact that it is the tendency of every form of the Hierarchical System to oppress and persecute, and that the Hierarchical element needs to be cast out of the Church, in order that she may resume her primitive purity and beauty; in a word that *a Church without a Bishop* is the best safeguard against the Hierarchical Despotism, and under God the best security of religious liberty.

Let it be remembered in closing, that I have confined

our argument, broad as it is, to the Papal Despotism as it grew out of the corruptions of Christianity, commencing in an age when the Romish Church was not universal, nor the Romish Bishop invested with the pontifical supremacy. The elements of this despotism, it has been truly remarked, neither Popes, Cardinals nor Councils, can be accused of originating. "The specific guilt of the Papal Tyranny is that of having *converted to the purposes of its spiritual usurpation* those congenial corruptions of faith and practice which it found in readiness, and which it received from a higher age, recommended by the unanimous approval of Saints, Doctors, and illustrious Writers." We doubt not there is to be a period of spiritual reformation, of conversion to Christ, among the numerous and widely extended members of the Romish Communion. In no other way do we expect the change and regeneration of that Church from Antichristian to Christian, and in no other way can it be exorcised of the elements of spiritual despotism. That change and that regeneration will constitute no small part of the glory of that era of Divine Mercy, shortly to be consummated in our world. Our trust is in the Word of God, in the descent and baptism of the Holy Spirit, and in the great declaration of Paul, which ought to be the watch-word for the welfare and prosperity of our Republic, WHERE THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IS, THERE IS LIBERTY!

Errata to be corrected in the First and Second Lectures

Page 33, second line, read *possessed* instead of 'proscribed.' Page 84, instead of 'Guelphs and Ghibellines' read *Ghibbellines and Guelphs.*

THE

HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM.

SOPHISMS

OF THE

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION

EXAMINED AND REFUTED

BY

THE WORD OF GOD.

LECTURE IV.

BY

REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY SAXTON & MILES,

No. 205 Broadway.

BOSTON—SAXTON, PEIRCE & CO.

844.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by
SAXTON & MILES,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

S. W. BENEDICT & CO., PRINT.,
128 Fulton Street.

INTRODUCTION.

It was a declaration of Milton, worthy to be written in every language in the world, that "to us nothing can be catholic or universal in religion, but what the Scripture teaches; WHATSOEVER WITHOUT SCRIPTURE PLEADS TO BE UNIVERSAL IN THE CHURCH, IN BEING UNIVERSAL, IS BUT THE MORE SCHISMATICAL." This principle every generous Protestant will act upon, in argument as well as in practice.

It may be, however, that in regard to this lecture some may think the author not sufficiently guarded, in developing the absolute and entire freedom of the New Testament from any commanded form as to church government and ministerial ordination. I have endeavored simply, and without prejudice, to follow what is written in the Word of God, and to mark what is *not* written there, which nevertheless the hierarchical and spiritual despotism seeks to enforce upon the conscience. The apostolical successionists have made out of ordination by the laying on of the hands of a diocesan bishop a sacramental mystery as inscrutable and powerful as any piece of Indian or Oriental magic. I have shown that there is not one passage in the New Testament, in which the laying on of hands is mentioned as a ceremony accompanying introduction into the Christian ministry. The ceremony itself is to be regarded as suitable, becoming, and solemn; and if the Christian church agree to adopt it in the appointment of her ministers, it is a beautiful and appropriate rite. But it is not essential, not commanded in Scripture. It cannot be proved that it was ever used by the Apostles in the appointment of elders

in the churches. I have stated this so strongly, that some persons, accustomed to regard this ceremony as essential to ministerial ordination, may deem that I have gone too far. I would merely beg that they closely examine the Scriptures on this point, before they decide.

In considering the wickedness of the exclusive and intolerant spirit of Episcopacy, it is important to remember that we are in the nineteenth century of the publication and profession of the Christian religion. We are in the midst, also, of an age of MISSIONS, or what we had hoped would prove such, in which the blessed and glorious ministration of the Spirit abroad might be expected to check and put to shame such intolerant enforcement of a religion of forms at home. As a nation, also, we are sprung from the loins of an ancestry, who resisted, even to the death, that same religious intolerance, that same arrogance of formalism, and who also suffered from it even to the death. We are in a country, likewise, where we have proclaimed and believed that the principles of religious liberty were known and acted on in such perfection of purity as never any people in any age of the world have given to their development. Our position, our parentage, our discipline, our government, our institutions, all God's great and gracious providences with us, all the flood of light and dearly purchased experience he hath poured out upon us, should combine to make us ashamed of an exhibition of religious formalism and intolerance, which might have been expected in the old corrupt, papistical, monarchical establishments of Europe, but which is as incongruous here as darkness is with light, and just as inconsistent, everywhere, with the spirit of the gospel. Our Episcopal friends will, if they are at all candid, pardon our severity; if they *will* give, they *must* also expect to receive.

SOPHISMS

OF THE

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

NATURE OF THE ARGUMENT

SIMPLICITY AND POWER OF THE APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE.

I NEED make no apology for going straight to the Scriptures to find divine truth and divine obligation. Whatever is binding upon us as Christians, whatever is essential to a Christian church, must be recorded there; if it be not there, the assumption of divine right is false. The whole fabric of *jure divino* Episcopacy is built upon sophisms, which not only find no support in the Scriptures, but are contradicted therein. If you knock away these sophisms the fabric falls. And hence the manifest unwillingness of Episcopalians, who assume the divine right of their order, to come to the Scriptures, point by point, and examine texts in their simple, literal construction. Hence their love of

the Fathers, and their appeal to them as umpires; an appeal the more confident in proportion to the distance between them and the Apostles, and the manifest increase of the corruptions of Christianity. Who are the Fathers? I shall answer in the striking language of Milton, "Whatever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance hath drawn from old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shell or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are the Fathers." Of what value is an appeal to them? Let their own grave discussion, how it may be lawful to use falsehood as a medicine for the advantage of those who require such a method, determine. It is among these volumes, full of interpolations, forgeries, and lying, pious frauds, that the advocates of prelatical Episcopacy love to hide themselves; it is by the light of such interpreters that they wish to investigate the Holy Scriptures. Thus they mingle their controversy with heterogeneous matter; they play about in the bogs and morasses of the Fathers and the standards of the churches, where the questions are endless, the paths interminable; thus they encompass themselves with what Milton well calls "a *fog* of witnesses."

I am sometimes reminded, by the course of this controversy, of the experience of the celebrated Mr. Scrope in fishing for salmon in the river Tweed. He had one day a bite from a fish so large and obstinate, that he found his line would not have strength to bring him to, if he attempted it; and his only resource was either to lose his spoil, or to plunge into the stream, and wading, running, floundering, at the risk of his life, to follow him and tire him out. And so the indefatigable sportsman

went, over cascades and rocks, through deep water and shallow, down the stream for miles, the greater part of a sportsman's day, till the fish gave in, and the prize was secured by a protracted chase, which would have been lost at the outset by an attempt to bring him to the bank at the first point in the conflict.

Just so with this controversy; if you engage in it anywhere out of the Scriptures, you will have to be dragged through swamps and quagmires, over cascades and precipices; and if you secure your salmon, it will have to be done almost at the risk of your life, and with great patience of contradiction. You will have to flounder

> O'er bog or steep, through strait, rough, dense or rare,

through the dark ages, and the canon law, and the church standards, and the chaos of the Fathers, where

> At length a universal hubbub wild
> Of stunning sounds, and voices all confused,
> Borne through the hollow dark, assaults the ear
> With loudest vehemence.

Thither, to continue the illustration from Milton, the undaunted *jure divino* controversialist plies his way;

> Undaunted to meet there whatever power
> Or spirit of the nethermost abyss
> Might in that noise reside, of whom to ask
> Which way the nearest coast of darkness lies,
> Bordering on light.

For this is the most definite question you can ask of the Fathers, *which way the nearest coast of darkness lies, bordering on light?* And here, in this dim twilight,

where the shades of darkness from the thickening corruptions of Christianity begin to gather, are the outposts of diocesan episcopacy, here are its sentinels, here is its camp, here, outside the limits of Apostolical Christianity, is its armory, here are its weapons of defence and aggrandizement, and here its youthful students exercise that discipline in prelatical ecclesiastical history, which accustoms them to put tradition before the Bible, to judge and interpret the Bible by tradition, and under cover of a breastwork of patristical tradition to come to those texts that are against them. But the true Biblical student loves to take his stand-point in the Bible itself. Here we take our stand-point, and from this point, and not from the light of corrupt ages, we survey and detect the sophisms, on which the fabric of episcopal exclusiveness is built. It is in this way that I mean to carry on my argument, in showing, one by one, the nature of these sophisms, and applying to them, for this purpose, the infallible text of the Sacred Scriptures in their simple, common sense construction.

In other words, I shall put the pretensions of diocesan episcopacy, one by one, into the crucible of the Word of God, and if they come out gold, well and good, we will all use them; but if they come out dross, we will throw them away. And in this process, let one thing be guarded against, and that is, the acceptance of glosses or constructions *put upon* passages of Scripture, which do not grow out of them, cannot be found in them. For example, Paul says to Timothy, in his second epistle, after exhorting him to be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus, "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same

commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." The passage refers manifestly to the instructing of teachers in the truths of the gospel, for their work. There is neither word nor intimation in regard to ordination, or the power of ordination in it, much less as to any succession of such power. The course of the argument stops at teaching, not at ordaining. It is not said, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to *ordain* others also, but, to *teach* others also. Now, here would be a gloss or construction forced upon the passage, which it will not bear, if you attempt to argue from it the power of ordination; much more absurd is it, if you argue that Timothy alone had that power, and was here commanded to commit it to others, that they in their turn might ordain others also. I might just as well argue from Timothy iv. 13, that the cloak which Paul left at Troas was a peculiar surplice, necessary to be used in ordaining elders, and that one of the books he sent for was a church liturgy, prepared by the Saviour, out of which Paul must read the ordinational service. Indeed there is almost nothing which might not be proved from Scripture, were we permitted to impress upon it our own foreign constructions, instead of simply drawing from it the meaning contained in it.

You have all heard of constructive treason, or making a man guilty of treason by putting such a construction on the statute as it was never intended to bear. Now there is such a thing as making a constructive episcopacy, inasmuch as no form of diocesan episcopacy is to be found in the Scriptures, by putting thus upon certain passages a construction which they

will not bear, and evidently were never intended to bear. Suppositions and conjectural assumptions are made to do the work, which plain Scriptural texts and the whole tenor of the Scriptures refuse to accomplish. The prelatical successionists use the word of God like dishonest players with loaded dice. Just so with the advocates of episcopacy by divine right, in the artificial, forced use they make of texts of Scripture. Their dice are loaded.

SOPHISM FIRST. CONSTRUCTION FORCED UPON THE COMMISSION OF THE DISCIPLES IN MATTHEW XXVIII. 19.

(I.) The first sophism to be exposed is in the construction forced upon the commission of the Apostles. The advocates of prelatical episcopacy begin with the assertion that the commission to preach was restricted to the Apostles, and, by a perfectly gratuitous unauthorized inference, to those whom the Apostles should ordain with the same commission. Now it happens that in that commission there is not one word said about ordaining others, nor any power given so to do. If, therefore, you restrict the commission to preach simply to the Apostles, you must also show some other passage empowering them as plainly to commission others, or you can have no succession at all. The commission to preach is a totally different thing from a commission to appoint preachers; it no more implies the authority to appoint others, or to exclude others, than the commission of Attorney-general of the United States implies the authority to appoint all the members of the legal profession, and to exclude all others from

the practice of the law. Inferences of this kind are not admissible; but if they were, then we should with the same right infer that all to whom the Apostles preached, would and did, in receiving the gospel, receive therewith the commission to preach the gospel.

But we need not resort to inferences. From a strict and minute comparison of the Evangelists, it is clear, first, that this commission to preach the gospel was a thing separate from the apostolic commission, it was not given to constitute apostles. This is manifest from the fact that Thomas was not present with the other disciples, when the commission to preach the gospel was given them. The Apostles had had this commission before; it was a part of their apostolic office; but it was not restricted to them, and it was now given to others besides them. A minute examination of the Evangelists, I say, demonstrates this. There were other disciples besides the Apostles present, when our Lord said to the disciples, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. There were, especially, the two disciples who had walked to Emmaus, whose understandings the Lord had opened, and to whom he had expounded, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself. To these men, as well as to the eleven, the Lord addressed the commission to preach the gospel. But besides these, there were others with them, to and with whom, while they spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst, and said unto them, unto the disciples there assembled, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost. And he opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures. Moreover,

if you take the account of this commission in Matthew alone, it is evident that there were other disciples to whom it was addressed besides the eleven; the "some who doubted" were certainly in addition to the eleven; besides, there were those whom the Lord had appointed to meet him in that mountain, and among them, doubtless, were those hundred and twenty disciples, whom we find immediately on their return from this meeting, gathered with Peter and the other apostles. There were all those men to whom Peter refers, and whom he describes in Acts i. 21, 22, "men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us." These are the men to whom the Lord Jesus, in giving his last commission, said (Luke xxiv. 48,) Ye are witnesses of these things. To these men, as well as to the Apostles, was the commission in Matt. xxviii. 19, addressed. The argument on this point, from a comparison of the Evangelists and the Acts of the Apostles, cannot be refuted.

SECOND LINE OF ARGUMENT.

But even if this were less clear, there is another line of argument, which overturns the doctrine of the apostolical succession from its foundation, which is the argument drawn from the appointment of the seventy. He must have hardihood indeed who should assert that these seventy were not sent out with a commission to preach the gospel. He that heareth you, said Christ, heareth me. And he must have equal hardihood, who should say that this commission was ever taken back.

It was confirmed, as is manifest from Luke x. 19; and these seventy, as is manifest from Acts i. 21, 22, were all present when our Lord's last commission was given, which commission, if it was given to the Apostles, was given also to them. Whether it were or were not, they were already preachers of the gospel, commissioned by Christ, and remained such to the end of life. And if our blessed Lord said to any of his ministers, he said to all, I am with you always, even to the end of the world; to the end of the world *with all who preach the gospel.* He could not mean to restrict this promise to those preachers then before him, for they would not live to the end of the world; he does not restrict it to those whom these persons should ordain, for he here gives them no commission to ordain others, but to preach to others; he says no syllable about ordination, nor hints at it; but he does say, I am with all that preach my gospel to the end of time. The question how they are to become preachers, is not even remotely mingled with this commission, nor involved in it; it had been settled long ago, when God said, "I will pour out my Spirit upon your children, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams, and even your servants and handmaidens shall prophesy." And what unparalleled absurdity to suppose that our Lord was here involving ordination by apostles as the only succession of this ministry, when his own blessed Spirit was already hovering over Jerusalem to make a hundred and twenty preachers at once, as the Spirit gave them utterance, preachers who never should have, as they never should need, any other ordination! What absurdity, when in the very terms of the com-

mission he had said that not those whom the Apostles should ordain should be preachers, but those who should believe in the Apostles' preaching; not a word of any duty to appoint other preachers, but simply, Preach the gospel to every creature. "And then signs shall follow," not them who are ordained, but "*them who believe.* In my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues." Speak what? The gospel of Christ. They shall preach the gospel, and preach it too with miraculous power, not, if they are ordained, but simply, if they believe. I would not trust that man to interpret the simplest text of Scripture, who can assert, in the face of all this, that the promise of Christ was based upon the condition of ordination by the apostles; a condition not only not hinted at, but absolutely false and impossible, as is evident both from the context and the preceding and succeeding history.

THIRD LINE OF ARGUMENT.

There is another passage, which sheds a striking light upon our argument, a light the more powerful for being incidental. It is in Luke ix. 59, 60. Our Lord had commanded a certain individual to follow him. It was an authoritative command of discipleship. "Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. Jesus said unto him, Let the dead bury their dead; but go thou, and PREACH THE KINGDOM OF GOD!" Now according to the hypothesis of prelatical episcopacy our Blessed Lord must have said to the Apostles, My lord bishops, here is work for you to do; take this man and ordain him, for his commission to preach must come only through you. What

extreme of absurdity! If this man obeyed Christ, was he a preacher or was he not? And when our Blessed Lord shortly afterwards issued his last command to the disciples, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, did this command take away and nullify this man's commission? It must have done so, or there was a preacher of the gospel out of the line of apostolical succession. Did that command take away also, and nullify, the commission of the seventy, given and confirmed by the Saviour? It must have done so, or here were seventy preachers of the gospel out of the line of apostolical succession.

Again, the hypothesis of prelatical episcopacy asserts that the commission to preach the gospel involved the commission to ordain others also, if not, then the Apostles had no commission to ordain. But if it did, then the commission of the seventy involved the commission to ordain others also, so that here are two distinct lines of succession already established, having twelve heads in one, and seventy in the other. And now let any episcopal bishop tell us, if he can, to which of these two lines, constituted on his own hypothesis, he traces up his own authority to preach the gospel! Or at a much later period, let him tell us, if he can, to which of the two distinct and opposite reigning lines of popes, bishops and councils, he traces the passage of the apostolical commission down upon his own head and into his own palm for ordination! That such opposing lines existed through whole generations is matter of undisputed history, and according to the episcopal hypothesis, one must have been right, and one wrong, or both were illegitimate, for each excommunicated the other; but from one or the other, every

prelatical bishop, every man in the succession, must draw his authority. They are, therefore, every one of them vitiated and rendered null by this very uncertainty. According to the principles of common sense and common law, they are every one *bastardized;* for of two distinct and opposite lines of ancestry, they cannot tell to which they belong, nor, with any certainty, whether they can claim parentage from either.

FOURTH LINE OF ARGUMENT.

But there is another line of argument still, pursued equally from the Scripture, which completes this to demonstration, and which shows that the greater the certainty with which the prelatical successors and their trains of ordination trace themselves to either of these lines, the greater also is the certainty that they are out of the true line of the ministry of Christ. The more they confirm their own hypothesis, the more indisputably they prove themselves to be unauthorized intruders into the pastorship and government of Christ's flock. The argument is of immense importance, commencing in the first verse of the tenth chapter of the gospel according to John, in the words of Jesus.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door, is the Shepherd of the sheep. I AM THE DOOR." Mark here, the Lord Jesus does not say, The Apostles are the door, or, Ye, my Apostles, are the door, or, The Apostolic Commission is the door, or, The line of succession from the Apostles is the door; but I AM THE DOOR. Christ himself is the

door. Then every Pope and Bishop not introduced by Christ, not ordained by the Holy Spirit, is a thief and a robber. And what are they, whom thieves and robbers ordain? What ordinational *virus* is that which passes through the wolfish hearts, and through the tainted palms, and down upon the bald pates of thieves and robbers? Now we can show you hundreds of instances, not solitary, but continued from generation to generation, in which men have been themselves ordained, and have ordained others, who, had they lived in the Apostles' day, would have been anathematized as Simon Magus, and had they lived in our day, would have been sent to the state's prison for life, or hanged upon the gallows, for their crimes! Whoremongers and adulterers, murderers and liars, we can name to you in the boasted prelatical succession from the Apostles, generation after generation, with not one pious personage known of to break the links of diabolical wickedness, the chain of demoniacal succession! What sort of shepherds were these? Did they come in by the door? Did Jesus Christ ordain them? Will any man have the blasphemous daring to say that our Blessed Lord put these men into the ministry?—that the Saviour ordained men, against whom he at the same time warned his churches? Did they come in by Christ? If not, then were they thieves and robbers. And what kind of ministers could these thieves and robbers ordain? If the doctrine of the apostolical succession were true, those that are in it are thieves and robbers; they are out of the true ministry; and it is only those, who have their ordination from some other source, that are the true shepherds.

I press this point. Either these whoremongers, and murderers, and liars, in the pretended priest's office, were ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ, or they were not. If you say that they were, then what blasphemy is it that you utter against his holy character! It is, in effect, the blasphemy of those who said of old time, that he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils; for if ever the devil appeared on earth in human shape, it was in the persons of some of those who were called universal bishops, or were bishops under them, to carry out their atrocities. In holding this daring assumption of the apostolical succession, you come as near the borders of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, as any man would wish to tread, should he be trying the experiment how nearly he might blaspheme without being convicted of it. The Saviour put these men, these demons rather, into the ministry? Let the thought perish, rather than be uttered! For of whom did our Blessed Lord speak, or against whom did he warn his people, when he said, Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, come to you in the pretence of a line and a commission direct from the Apostles, but inwardly they are ravening wolves? Of whom did he speak, if not of such as these? And will you dare to say that such as these were put by the Saviour himself into the ministry? But if not, they were thieves and robbers. And who were those false apostles, of whom Paul speaks, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ? And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if Satan's ministers be also transformed as the ministers

of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works. And will you say that such came in by the Door, that such were put into the ministry by Christ?

And yet, such is the assertion to which the advocates of this apostolical succession are driven for the support of their pretensions! And we have them concocting the monstrous and abominable argument that our Lord Jesus put Judas into the ministry, and all the successors of Judas in sheep's clothing, in order to afford the prelatical successionists a standing proof that the wickedness of hell itself cannot vitiate the apostolical succession, but that it may come down unbroken, untainted, through the ministers and emissaries of Satan, no matter though the Lord forewarned his churches against such, and forbade them to receive them, and no matter though the Apostles Paul and Peter anathematize them, and declare them accursed. Yet it is argued that their very existence in the prelatical ministry, in the apostolical succession, was permitted by the Saviour, in order to show to the world that Satan himself could not vitiate the *virus* of that succession, and that the gates of hell, though set wide open into the ministry, should not prevail, neither to impair that succession, nor to injure the church under it! And to crown this argument, they even go back to those profane wretches, the sons of Eli, and attempt to prove that because their shocking wickedness did not cause God to remove the succession of the Jewish priesthood into another line, therefore the succession of adulterers and whoremongers in the house of God can never vitiate or change the line of apostolical succession under the Christian dispensation!

And all this in the face of that tremendous curse pronounced upon the line of Eli, on account of this very wickedness in his sons, and its allowance by their father. Read the curse, the whole of it, in the second chapter of the first book of Samuel, and then say if it is not daring profaneness almost unparalleled, to resort to the wickedness of Hophni and Phinehas, for a proof that still greater immorality in the Christian ministry cannot injure the true prelatical succession, cannot prove that the men guilty of it were not appointed of Christ! God said expressly that he *would* change the line of succession, that this very wickedness of these priests *caused* him to do it. "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever: but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed. And I will raise me up a faithful priest, and it shall come to pass that every one that is left in their house shall come and crouch to him for a piece of silver and a morsel of bread, and shall say, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priest's offices, that I may eat a piece of bread!" Let them go to Hophni and Phinehas that choose, for arguments to support the apostolical succession, and to Judas also; the resort does but strikingly demonstrate the hopeless iniquity of their assumptions!

SACRIFICING PRIESTS ARE NOT OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY.

The cases of Nadab and Abihu are much more in point than those of Hophni and Phinehas, for they were struck dead, though in the line of the succession, for

offering strange fire, which the Lord had not commanded. Determine the character of a great portion of the *priests* in the apostolical succession by this incident, and you would condemn them at once, as no ministers of Christ. Their offering has been strange fire, which the Lord hath not commanded, and not only strange fire but blasphemy. For, what else is the pretended offering up of the body and blood of Christ as a daily sacrifice in the Mass, but the most shocking blasphemy? Or, if it were not blasphemy, still a strange presumptuous fire, which God not only hath not commanded, but hath forbidden, in that he hath said, "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was ONCE offered to bear the sins of many." And again, "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE. And every priest (under the old dispensation) standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this man, after he had offered ONE SACRIFICE for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by ONE OFFERING he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

Now we say that it is evident that the profane assumption of the office and business of sacrificing priests on the part of the Christian ministry, is sufficient to put them out of that ministry, as not belonging to it; especially when there is added the blasphemous pretence of offering up in sacrifice to God, the Son of God himself, body and blood, soul and divinity, daily. They

who make such pretences, are like Nadab and Abihu; but they are not of the Christian ministry; they are not ministers of Christ. Yet they are in the line of the boasted apostolical succession; they occupied, for more than a thousand years, all the parallels of that line; if the cord has many strands, as has been amusingly argued, they are strands of sacrificing priests, and not preachers of the gospel, twisted together. And what sort of ministers could these men ordain? And what sort of a succession is that which comes down from such men? A succession of strange fire, a succession of death, a succession from men who were not themselves ministers of Christ, and could not ordain ministers. If, therefore, you demonstrate yourselves to be of the apostolical succession, and thereon found your claim as ministers of Christ, it is a demonstration that you are profane intruders into that ministry, put there by men whose touch was sacrilege and death!

GENEALOGICAL LOGIC OF THE SUCCESSION.

When the demand is made on the advocates of the apostolical succession that they show step by step the proofs that they possess it, that it has come down to them alone unbroken, unvitiated, the most general reply is in the most general terms, that it is obviously impracticable, and not to be demanded, that they should show their genealogy for so many centuries, but that it is perfectly clear that they derive their commission from men who were themselves ordained, who derived it in their turn from men who were also ordained, and so on to a point "whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary!"

And this is the cat,
That killed the rat,
That eat the malt,
That lay in the house
That Jack built.

Besides our nursery rhymes, we are reminded by this powerful process of logic, of the ratiocination of the Indians in regard to the Cosmogony, that the world rests on the back of an elephant, the elephant stands on a great rhinoceros, the rhinoceros on a huge tortoise, and after the tortoise is chaotic mud. This chaos is what the prelatical successionists have to cast the anchor of their argument in, after all, for they go back to a point beyond which the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, for the very good reason that the memory of man runneth not thither at all. Beyond the memory of man! Then assuredly you have got beyond certain knowledge. And now, how will you trace the precious line of the true succession? Here are two, three, four or five popes, and as many lines of prelatical wolves in sheep's clothing. Which of them will you choose? Here are almost forty tracks save one. Which is the track of the Apostles? Having come to this gulf, your scent is at fault. What will you do? A river of chaos runs through it, and your apostolical succession has escaped you.

The keen instinct even of prelatical ambition is at fault. I am reminded of the anecdote of the dog in search of his master, who, coming to a point where three roads met, smelt at the first, smelt at the second, and then darted off upon the third, concluding that, as his master was not to be traced in either of the two

first, he had gone the other of course. Now in searching for your true succession, you are very much in need of a sagacious ecclesiastical pointer. You don't know which way the sacerdotal, sacramental, ordinational virtue was shot through the dark ages. If, as the doctrine of prelacy affirms, it comes through the palm of the hand, no matter what the heart or the head may be, a keen-scented dog could soon find it out. Pity, I say, that you had not such an ecclesiastical pointer to course the genuine hare of apostolical authority! The absurdity is such as makes the supporters of it the laughing-stock of Christendom. One of their own bishops in England has well said that to spread abroad this notion of the apostolical succession, and to insist on its necessity, is to make themselves the derision of the world; and truly, nothing but a bigotry and blindness next to insanity, could prevent men of common sense from at once acknowledging it.

NECESSITY OF AN AUTHENTIC, PROVEN GENEALOGY.

We call for the genealogy of these men, who thus gratuitously assume themselves to be the successors, and the only successors, of the Apostles. Their very assumption makes the demonstration of their genealogy essential, because the assumption is imposed as necessary to salvation. If their genealogy be of divine right, and a faith in it essential to salvation, they must show it. No man can believe in it unless he either sees it for himself, or has the Word of God for it; and as our apostolical successionists have not yet shown us their own names set down in any divinely inspired

catalogue, and traced up to the Apostles (however they may yet bring forward such a pretence), they must take the other alternative, and give us a ground of belief in their successionship, by showing us plainly their own genealogy up to the source from which they pretend to derive it. If the matter in dispute were the hereditary right to any crown in Christendom, a man would be deemed a candidate for Bedlam, who should dare to come forward and demand, on pain of high treason, the belief of all men in him as the hereditary successor, without showing, or pretending to show, one particle of evidence that he is of the blood-royal. He may trace back a lineage as far as he pleases, and call it royal, but if he does not trace it to the royal stock he is an impudent impostor. And just so with those who step forward and make the insane demand that we, on peril of our salvation, regard and receive them as the only ministers of Christ, on the ground of their having come in the line of what they call the apostolical succession. They are impudent impostors, if they do not show and prove to us demonstrably, step by step, the line of their genealogy. A single break scatters their pretended proof to the winds. An unbroken line must be demonstrated, or it is no line at all. It is no more proof to us that they are of the apostolical line, to show that ministers have been ordained generation after generation, from time immemorial, than the fact that Confucius lived before the birth of Christ proves Mohammed to have descended down from Judas.

Two things are necessary, neither of which is possible, for the advocates and appropriators of this insane

assumption. They must first prove that there is such a thing as the apostolical succession; which they cannot do but by tracing, step by step, with unquestioned demonstration, a lineage of ordination direct down through the whole waste and chaos of time and iniquity, for eighteen hundred years, from some one particular apostle. It is manifest, from the nature of the case, that generalities and suppositions are here mere absurdities. There must be demonstration, step by step, or there is no proof at all. Probabilities, in this case, are of no avail whatever; they are, as in tracing a line of ancestry, mere proofs of bastardy. There is either an apostolical succession, or there is not; it can be proved that there is, only by pointing out and demonstrating the line; and the moment you have done this you have put an end to all question who is of the line, because if there be an apostolical succession, the particular line, in full demonstration, is the only proof of it.

In the second place, they must prove that they themselves are of this line, which again they cannot do but by tracing, step by step, with unquestioned demonstration, a lineage of ordination *backwards*, direct, beyond the same whole waste and chaos of time, revolution, and iniquity, for eighteen hundred years, up to some one particular apostle. We have not yet found a Bedlamite who can do this; I do not know that this freak of insanity has been as yet developed in any one of the supporters of this fanaticism of the succession; how soon it may be, we cannot tell.

PROFANENESS OF THE MODE OF ARGUMENT FOR THE SUCCESSION.

One thing is clear; they have dared profanely to degrade the Word of God, by putting the evidence for the truth and authenticity of the Scriptures on a level with the existing evidence of their apostolical succession, which is no evidence at all. This is a profaneness which has been shown in the most masterly manner in one of the letters of Dr. Potts, to lead inevitably to sheer infidelity, throwing away the whole internal evidence of Scripture, and rendering the external evidence worthless. Of the infidel tendency of this assumption I shall, therefore, say nothing; it has been sufficiently demonstrated. But I will take another view. I will admit, for the sake of argument, what the assumption of the prelatist supposes, that there is no internal evidence of Christianity in the Scriptures, any more than there is of apostolical succession in the air. Now, then, the assumption of the successionists is this, that there is as much and as strong evidence that they are of the only true line, as there is external evidence of the truth and authenticity of the Scriptures; which, after all, they say is only probability. But there is this infinite difference. The external evidence of the Scriptures is not essential to salvation; whereas the evidence of the apostolical succession is made by its advocates to be thus essential. Now, had the external evidence of the Scriptures been a thing essential to salvation, it would have been made as clear as the Scriptures themselves; it would not have been left to be ascertained by probabilities. But we have the

Word of God itself in our own possession, and it would still be the Word of God if all its external evidence were annihilated; so that for faith, for salvation, it is of no moment whatever whether a man have so much as heard whether there be any external evidence. Much more it is of no moment whatever, whether a man ever heard of this bugbear of the apostolical succession. But if that succession were essential to salvation, as its advocates arrogantly and blasphemously assert, then they would be bound to show, with as much certainty as if it were written from heaven, their own commission, and they would be bound to show every step by which it is demonstrated; and if one single step fails, so that they have to rely on supposition, which they may, perhaps, call faith, their claim fails. Such a thing, a matter not susceptible of proof, cannot be necessary to salvation, cannot be of any essential importance.

Besides, in what is this faith to be exercised? Not in any Word of God surely; for the successionists will not say that they, Richard Roe and John Doe, have been named and commissioned in God's Word; and the faith in the promise of Christ to be with his ministers is of no use for them, unless they first prove themselves to be among his ministers, which on their own theory they cannot do, except they first prove themselves to be of the apostolical succession, which again they cannot do except by faith in the Saviour's promise to be with his ministers, which again does them no good, unless they can prove that they are among his ministers, which again they confess themselves unable to prove, but by showing that they are of the succession, which

again they cannot show but by faith in the Saviour's promises; and so on *ad infinitum*. Here is a succession for you indeed, a succession in a circle. If ever there was a specimen of gross and ridiculous reasoning in a circle it is this. The apostolical succession has never been broken, because Christ promised to be with his ministers; we are of the apostolical succession, because that succession has never been broken; and that succession has never been broken because we are ministers of Christ, who do now exist; and we are ministers of Christ because we are of the apostolical succession; and we are of the apostolical succession because it has never been broken!

IMMORAL TENDENCY OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

With great profaneness, with an immorality of reasoning which is scarcely outdone in Dens' Theology itself, the prelatical successionists argue that because wickedness in the Jewish Priesthood did not break up the line of succession there, neither can such wickedness break up the line of the assumed apostolical succession under the Christian dispensation. They argue from adulterous sons of Eli to the admission of adulterers in the Christian Ministry! They argue from the case of Balaam, who, they say, notwithstanding his wickedness, was a prophet, to the admission of men equally wicked, as ministers of Christ! And this in the face of such a description of Balaam, and such a warning of the churches against those who should be like him, in Peter and in Jude; "cursed children,

which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam." But indeed, if because Balaam was used of God as a prophet, therefore Balaams may be admitted in the line of the apostolical succession, we might just as well argue that because Balaam's ass was used of God as a prophet, therefore the existence of bonâ-fide asses may be admitted in the line of the apostolical succession, and yet not vitiate it at all. Indeed an actual braying ass ordained in the ministry would not disgrace its sacredness one half so much as the ordination and existence of such murderers and adulterers, as have sometimes, from generation to generation, constituted links in the boasted apostolical succession. Just so it is gravely argued that because Caiaphas who crucified Christ, was still a legitimate high-priest, therefore the ministers of Christ under the Christian dispensation may also crucify him afresh and put him to an open shame by their villanies, and yet not break or vitiate the line of the apostolical succession in the least. We can apply to such reasonings as these nothing but the image which Jude uses of such exemplars as are resorted to, "raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame."

NO RELATION BETWEEN THE JEWISH PRIESTHOOD AND THE PRETENDED APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

But even this very vile argument used by the advocates for prelacy proceeds on an assumption of the whole matter in question. It is *assumed* that there is such a thing as the apostolical succession, and then it is *argued*, that because the most diabolical wickedness

did not break the succession in the Jewish Priesthood, therefore it cannot break this assumed succession in the Christian ministry. Here again the argument (which, however, has not begun to be an argument), involves and proceeds upon the ground of a second assumption, namely, that the apostolical succession is of the same nature with that of the Jewish Priesthood; if not, how can any argument be admitted from one to the other? But if you would conform the Christian Ministry to the Jewish Priesthood in its corruptions, with the line of succession unbroken notwithstanding, you must conform it in other points. Your own assumption compels you to run the parallel, and in what points soever you are deficient, and do not come up to the requisites for an unbroken line in the Priesthood, your apostolical succession fails and becomes worthless. Run the parallel then, as your argument compels you to do, and you speedily find that in the line of the Jewish Priesthood, for a man to be acknowledged as a Priest, and to be permitted to perform the functions of a Priest, it was absolutely necessary that he should demonstrate his genealogy. He must demonstrate his claim to belong to the succession, by showing an authenticated, proven genealogy, step by step, otherwise he was turned out. All claim to a succession, without such demonstration, is a piece of vulgar impudence, imposture and absurdity. You assume, forsooth, in the first place, the figment of an apostolical succession, and next you assume yourselves to be in the line of that succession, but when the demonstration of your claim is demanded, when your genealogy is required to prove your descent, Oh, you answer, we

have no proof of that, we cannot be expected to give proof of that; the external evidence of the Scriptures themselves is not a mathematical demonstration, much less can you require us to demonstrate our genealogy. Why, we cannot trace it half way through the dark ages. We must have faith in Christ's promise that he would be with the ministry always to the end of the world.

Now we say, your proposition of the apostolical succession, without a demonstration of your genealogy, is an audacious, arrogant absurdity. In the case of the Jewish Priesthood we find that even where there was a probability, nay, a certainty, that individuals were of the line of the succession, yet, if they could not *prove their genealogy*, they were cast out. Read it in the book of Ezra, ii. 59—62. "They sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found; therefore were they, as polluted, put from the Priesthood." Now this, according to the confession of the Prelatists themselves, is the dilemma to which they of the true succession are reduced; they cannot even show their fathers' house, and their pedigree whether they were of Israel, much less the register of their genealogy. Now what should you think of a man who should come forward and lay claim to an estate, which has been always held in common for the benefit of the city of New York, as the property of the city, and upon being required to show his proofs, to produce the evidences of his heirship down from the original grant, he shall say, I cannot be expected to demonstrate that; the nature of the case is such as not to be susceptible of documentary or mathe-

matical proof. I can tell you that my father and my grandfather always said that that estate belonged to them, and I can show you that I am their lineal successor, but you cannot expect me to produce the documents, after so long lapse of time and so many revolutions. Even of the external evidence of the Scriptures you do not require mathematical proof, you have to content yourself with probabilities, and since there is certainly a succession of ownership in this property, and my father and grandfather always maintained that it belonged to them, it is necessary to exercise faith; for the original terms of the grant declared that the property should always be in existence, and as it must always exist as somebody's property, and as I exist as a claimant, it is a degree of demonstration as strong as that which you have for the authenticity of the Scriptures, that the original terms of the grant meant me, and contemplated my existence as the holder of the property. It must have been so, for my father and grandfather declared it! This is the amount of the assumptions of prelacy. It is not wonderful that Archbishop Wake himself declared the forthputters of such assumptions to be insane. They are indeed more fit for a Romish Bedlam, than for the limits of sane Christendom.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY NOT AN APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, BUT THE POWER OF AN ENDLESS LIFE IN CHRIST.

But now in regard to this singular reference by the advocates of the apostolical succession to the line of the Jewish Priesthood in support of their allegation

that the most devilish wickedness cannot vitiate their genealogy as Christian Priests, we have another answer to make, which demonstrates the presumptuous and absurd nature of the importance attached to such a succession. It is this, namely, that the line of the Jewish succession itself *was* set aside and departed from (and that, according to the threatening of God in the ears of Eli, because of the wickedness of the priests in the Levitical line), by the coming of our Lord, in an unchangeable priesthood, *not in, but out of that line.* This argument is powerfully set forth by Paul in verses 11—16 of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and also in verses 6—9 of the eighth chapter of the same. "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident, for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life."

So also the Christian ministry, springing from Christ, the Great Shepherd and Bishop of the sheep, are "made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life;" not after the

rule of a pretended, apostolical succession, but after the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, by the Holy Ghost, by a new spiritual creation. The true succession of the Christian ministry is the power of an endless life, not because of the figment of a line from the Apostles, skin-deep in the palm of the hand, but because it is the life of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ, the Church, because it is a perpetual new creation and anointing from on high by that grace which dwelleth with the Church and shall be in the Church for ever. It is the power of an endless life, because it is no lineal succession of men, but in every case a new and fresh spiritual consecration by the Saviour. It is the *power* of an endless life, in opposition to the *ceremony* of an apostolical succession, because it is the ministration of the Spirit in opposition to the religion of tradition and of form. It is the religion of regeneration by the Spirit and of ministerial unction and consecration by the Spirit, instead of the religion of baptismal regeneration and sacramental consecration by the palm of the prelatical hand. The true ministry is the power of an endless life in opposition to the formalism of a sacramental death; a death, in which a thousand Judases might be in the ministry, crucifying the Lord afresh and putting him to an open shame; and yet, inasmuch as it comes in the line of the apostolical succession, it is to be invested with the form of life, and as sacredly enshrined, admired, and venerated, as if it were the manna of the soul, or the shew-bread from heaven!

There is a noble passage in Milton, in which this freedom of the Christian ministry, and its superiority to the law of a carnal commandment, are so admirably

set forth, that I shall quote it. "It cannot be unknown by what expressions the holy Apostle St. Paul spares not to explain to us the nature and condition of the law, calling those ordinances, which were the chief and essential offices of the priests, the elements and rudiments of the world, both weak and beggarly. Now to breed and bring up the children of the promise, the heirs of liberty and grace, under such a kind of government as is professed to be but an imitation of that ministry, which engendereth to bondage the sons of Agar, how can this be but a foul injury and derogation, if not a cancelling of that birth-right and immunity, which Christ hath purchased for us by his blood? For the ministration of the law, consisting of carnal things, drew to it such a ministry, as consisted of carnal respects, dignity, precedence, and the like. And such a ministry established in the gospel, as is founded upon the points and terms of superiority, and nests itself in worldly honors, will draw to it, and we see it doth, such a religion as runs back again to the old pomp and glory of the flesh; for doubtless there is a certain attraction and magnetic force betwixt the religion and the ministerial form thereof. If the religion be pure, spiritual, simple, and lowly, as the gospel most truly is, such must the face of the ministry be. And in like manner, if the form of the ministry be grounded in the worldly degrees of authority, honor, temporal jurisdiction, we see with our eyes, it will turn the inward power and purity of the gospel into the outward carnality of the law; evaporating and exhaling the internal worship into empty conformities and gay shows. And what remains in that case but that we should run into as dangerous and deadly

apostasy as our lamentable neighbors the papists, who by this very snare and pitfall of imitating the ceremonial law, fell into that irrecoverable superstition as must needs make void the covenant of salvation to them that persist in this blindness."

SECOND SOPHISM IN THE USE OF THE WORD BISHOP.

(II.) The second point of sophistry to be noted, concerns the use of the word bishop. Every philosopher knows, and in reasoning on subjects overlaid with tradition, or encumbered with immemorial prejudices, which have been sanctified by power, has had to lament the misguiding influence of words, perverted from their original meaning, and yet made to retain all the power of that meaning over the common mind. The intellectual philosopher has to contend against the difficulties of sensuous images, clinging to metaphysical expressions, like sea-weed to a pearl oyster, and misinterpreting his meaning to those with whom he reasons. When he means the pearl, the undisciplined mind thinks of the clustering sea-weed. And just so with theology; and especially so with the word bishop. Fishing in the troubled waters of prelatical antiquity, the school of the famous apostolical succession have drawn up the great oyster of diocesan episcopacy; they have used for this purpose the drag-net of the Fathers, and they hold up the whole fish, with all its appendages, shell, sea-weed, and all, διοικησις, lordship, authority, priests, deacons, deans, hanging to it, and they say, This is the primitive bishop; this the meaning of the word bishop. And this signification they have so annexed and perpetuated, so

connected it in every man's mind with the fantastical image presented, fresh from the pool of the corruptions of Christianity, that it is extremely difficult to disintegrate the word from such connexions, from such extraneous appendages in the common mind. It has been covered, as Burke would say, with "the awful hoar-frost of innumerable ages;" and this frost lies so thick upon the word, that you really have to cut through ice to get at it. It is, I say, much more difficult to disintegrate the word from its ambitious prelatical incrustations, than it is to cut the hidden shining pearl from the shell of the oyster. Nevertheless, neither the oyster, nor the shell, nor the corals, nor the forests of sea-weed, which you show us in your drag-net, are the primitive pearl, or the growth of it, any more than the tiara and scarlet mantle of the Pope, investing a certain woman in the Apocalypse, are the growth of the threadbare cloak which Paul left at Troas. There is a pearl indeed, there is a primitive bishop, a pure, shining, simple minister of Jesus Christ; but the word bishop, the επισκοπος of the scriptures, no more means a diocesan bishop, a prelate of the modern Episcopal or Romish church, than the word *pearl* means oyster; and the modern ecclesiastical dignitary baptized with that name, no more means the bishop of the New Testament, than the word or the thing *oyster*, means pearl.

EVERY CHURCH ITS OWN BISHOP.

Now it is of essential importance that this sophism be kept in mind. When the fashionable exclusives of modern Christianity deck themselves with the cross of

their order, "No church without a bishop," they mean a prelate, an overseer of pastors the true bishops, and not a pastor, a primitive bishop; they mean the overseeing, the overlaying oyster, and not the primitive pearl. We say, also, No church without a bishop; that is, let every church have its own bishop; but we mean not the oyster, the prelate, but the pearl, the simple pastor of the flock, and minister of Jesus Christ. We hold to a bishop, as well as the sect of Episcopalians, but not the lordship of a bishop. We hold to such a bishop as Peter defines, when he says to the presbyters, Feed the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof, performing the duties of your office as bishops, not as being lords over God's heritage, but as examples to the flock. Peter does not say, taking the oversight of the churches nor of the pastors, as he must have said to a diocesan prelate, but of the flock, as Christ says now to his ministers. We hold to such a bishop as Paul defines, when he calls the elders of the church and says, Feed the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops. He does not say, Go the rounds of your diocese, and take care of the pastors, and keep the churches in order; he does not say, Oversee the churches and pastors of your diocese, as he must have said to modern Episcopal bishops, but, Feed that flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers. Nor does he single out one, and say to him, Act the επισκοπος, the bishop, as a prelatical overseer, but, Feed the flock, ye overseers, that flock, that church, in Ephesus, over which the Holy Ghost hath placed you as presbyters, as bish-

ops. In this primitive apostolic sense we hold the doctrine, No church without a bishop.

Every man may see the difference; let it be borne in mind. Let this word bishop be disintegrated from the folds, the involutions of lordship, title, rank, authority, under which it is buried, like the inveterate convolvings of Gentile authority, against the imitation of which, the Lord Jesus Christ warned and forbade his disciples. Let the word be restored to its simple primitive meaning, and the sophism ceases. The truth becomes this, namely, Every church its own bishop, its minister, its pastor, set over it in the Lord for its edification, and accountable to no bishop of bishops, but to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The perversion of this word grew out of human ambition. But so plain and palpable was its meaning in the New Testament, that for more than two hundred years it was not possible to turn it from its application. Even when restricted to the president among the presbyters, it still, for more than two hundred years, signified the pastor of a single church; the bishop was *primus inter pares*, first among the body of coëqual presbyters; though *they* were not bishops, he was still simply a presbyter. Neither office nor officer, like the modern Episcopal bishop and his diocese, had any existence. Not a sentence can be brought from the writings of the first two hundred and fifty years of the Christian church, which gives even an intimation of the existence of modern diocesan episcopacy, or a hint at the creation of prelatical dignity. Nor, when the term bishop, little by little enlarged and dignified, began its course of actual perversion, did

it without opposition advance towards the diocesan application. The Monk Jerome, a man of unbounded authority, in some respects the greatest of the Fathers, thundered his rebukes against the ambition of the bishops, which even then was growing faster than their name; and Jerome, writing about the year 375, called back the churches to the remembrance of the fact that in the New Testament, bishop and presbyter are the same, and that bishops had grown to be above presbyters "more by the custom of the church, than by the true dispensation of Christ."

The first genuine high churchman of antiquity, as he has been called, was Cyprian of Carthage, in whose writings, if anywhere, the elements of diocesan episcopacy ought to be found, if any such existed in his day; and yet, from his writings it is clearly manifest that the bishop in his time was the pastor of a single flock. Nay, he himself, with all his high-church notions, was the minister of a single church, nothing more. And the nearer you go to the Apostles' times, the more are the testimonies of the fathers entirely opposed to diocesan episcopacy; in this opposition they agree, in whatever else they differ. The argument from them is entirely against episcopacy; not a voice for two hundred years can be found to help or sanction it. And when you come so near to the Apostles as the epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, and that of Polycarp to the Philippians, the proof both from the letter and the spirit of these epistles (one of them being the epistle of a holy fellow-laborer of Paul), is overwhelming. But after a few centuries, the appeal to the Fathers is an appeal to lying witnesses.

PROGRESS OF THE ASSUMPTION.

The term being perverted, and the dignity of diocesan bishop established, it became thenceforward the interest of all parties to sustain, justify, and strengthen the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The apostolical succession was claimed, not for presbyters, but for bishops and the pope. And here we get into the track, in which the advocates of apostolical succession have been running round and round for centuries; the first man that lost his way, and made the complete circle, saying within himself, when he came to his own horse's footsteps, Here are the tracks of the Apostles, this is doubtless the succession; and the multitudes who have gone the same round ever since, uttering the same words, and always making the tracks of the Apostles broader and more beaten. In our day some men have had the hardihood to go even to the New Testament for diocesan bishops; but, in the first formation of the circle, the forgery was too recent for that; it was too manifest for any man to think of contradicting it, that presbyters and bishops, in the New Testament, are the same thing. They did not, therefore, dream of setting the bishops in their establishment *jure divino*. It was a very late period, even in the corruptions of Christianity, that gave birth to that monstrous pretension; if they could get bishops accepted *jure humano*, it was enough for them, for they knew that for such an order there was no *jus divinum* in existence. But, in our day, there are those who not only claim that this order, confessedly foreign from the New Testament, not to be

found in all the sacred oracles, an order of human invention and addition to the New Testament, should not only be received as a true clerical order, but that the church of Christ should not even be considered as a church without it! The claim is now, that that is the only church of Christ which possesses it. This is the very lunacy of ecclesiastical bigotry, more fit for the insane asylum than for a community of harmonious and sober-minded Christians.

It is humiliating to be obliged seriously to refute such pretensions; we would much rather treat them as the keepers of lunatics do their patients, who imagine themselves to be monarchs, or even incarnations of divinity; but if we should humor them, we should soon find their pretensions to exclusive Christianity to be no mere theory, but replete with the *virus* and sting of religious persecution. Besides, they rely so entirely upon assumption and assertion, and are accustomed to put forth their assertions in so bold and reckless a manner, as if they would have all the force of proof, that it becomes necessary to interpose a requisition for authority, and to show clearly, that besides the uncertainties and traditions of the fathers, they have nothing at all but assumption and assertion to rely upon. In fact, they do themselves confess as much as this, in the answer they sometimes make to our requisition of clear proof in the Scriptures. We have no such proof to show, they say; we cannot bring it, not a solitary text. And then, in order to cover up the weakness of their case, they deliberately debase and underrate the proof of scriptural doctrines in the Bible itself; asserting, with infidel profaneness, that it is impossible to prove

even the fundamental truths of Christianity by particular independent texts! In this they act not exactly the part of counterfeiters, but a much worse part, that of debasing and depreciating the true coin, in order that their own spurious stuff may not be seen and rejected as worthless. They are willing to undermine the buttresses of Christianity itself, rather than that their own miserable *shanties* should appear not so strong, or be seen to have no scriptural foundation. It is difficult to speak too strongly of the wickedness of this fanaticism.

THIS MODE OF REASONING INJURIOUS TO THE GOSPEL, AND DESTRUCTIVE OF ALL FAITH.

It is important to show, a little more at large, the evil and infidel tendency of their mode of procedure. They acknowledge their want of definite Scriptural proof, and also their entire failure to prove an unbroken descent from the Apostles. They then resort to faith, demanding, upon peril of our salvation, a faith which they present no proof for us to build upon. But in what is faith to be exercised? In an acknowledged uncertainty! Now observe the absurdity of this; compare it with the definite grounds on which faith is required of us in the gospel.

The faith which, in divine things, we are called upon to exercise, in peril of our salvation, is a faith built upon certainty, the highest certainty of which the human mind is capable, even the declaration and promise of God, so that he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar. Therefore, when God calls on us to exer-

cise faith, he gives us certainty as its foundation. But here, in the case of the apostolical succession, it is demanded of us that we exercise faith in an acknowledged uncertainty! The uncertainty is confessed, is avowed, and then is made a basis of faith, and that faith represented as essential to salvation! When God tells us to believe, he says, Believe, because it is proved; because it is certain by the highest proof. But these prelatical divines, these logicians of the apostolical succession, actually call on us to believe because it is *not* proved; nay, because it cannot *be* proved. *Credo, quia impossibile est.* And then, to cover and conceal the emptiness of their pretensions, they tell us, in effect, that nothing can be proved distinctly and clearly; that in the nature of things we have to believe without proof. Perhaps, then, they would have us rely on intuition for the proof of the apostolical succession. Not at all; nothing so definite as that; faith must have a larger sweep than that; this faculty has gained a new development in the apostolical successionists, and whereas the loftiest form of faith has ever been, I *believe* because I *know*, with these men the all-digesting, all-devouring formula is this, I believe, because I *don't* know; I believe, because it is uncertain.

When we call for the proof of their pretensions from God's word, they first of all prepare the way by deteriorating that kind of proof, and diminishing men's confidence in its importance; just like usurers, who secretly clip their neighbors' coin, in order that they may get it all into their own hands at a discount. Knowing well that they cannot produce one single text of scripture definitely in their favor, definitely

teaching their exclusive dogma, they dare to assert, in the face of the knowledge of all Christendom to the contrary, that not even one of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel can be proved in the same way, by definite, conclusive passages. They dare to say that Socinianism itself would triumph over evangelical truth, if that truth had to rely upon distinct, conclusive, explicit texts! I am at a loss how to characterize with sufficient severity the bold yet treacherous wickedness of such sophistry. Rather than that our cause should not be supported, or should seem to want support, say these men, we will involve the Christian system itself in our own weakness, we will bury the gospel itself in our ruins. If you will not eat our loaves alone, say they to the world, if you will not consent to take only the bread marked at our counter, we will debase and poison the bread of all Christendom. If you will insist upon the apostolical succession being proved from the Bible, then we will make all scriptural proof so doubtful as to be worthless, so doubtful, that you will be glad to go to tradition to defend yourselves from the attacks of infidels.

Their course is like that of men, who, having to fight in an open field with weapons to the use of which they are unaccustomed, but which their adversaries have at perfect command, have gone stealthily and put poison into the handles of their opponents' swords, and unscrewed the locks of their muskets, and wet their powder. Just so with these logicians of the apostolical succession; they dare not cope with the word of God as it is; they wet the powder.

But not only so, they have another resort. When

you demand their proof from Scripture, they say it must not surprise you, nor weaken your faith in their claims, even though you should not find them distinctly set forth in the Bible; for you are to remember that there are a great many things which our Saviour doubtless taught, that are not set down there, and prelatical episcopacy was doubtless one of them; so you must consider that which is not, as though it were; you must have a faith that shall honor the Scriptures by believing *what would have been in them*, if there could have been another volume. You are to remember the declaration of John, that if all that our Saviour said and did on earth had been written, the world itself could not have contained the books. Now a book on Diocesan Episcopacy, clearly teaching it, and making it essential to salvation, there can be no doubt was among those unwritten books of the Saviour. You must, therefore, have a faith not merely *in* Scripture, but *above* Scripture, comprising those things which are not, as though they were. When you read the Bible in search of Diocesan Episcopacy, and find it not, then say within yourself, This is doubtless one of the lost books of the Saviour; this is one of those volumes essential to salvation, that would have been written, if the world had been large enough. Poor world! I must learn not to circumscribe my faith by its dimensions; it is obviously not big enough to contain the august claims, the vast magnificence, the divine authority of Diocesan Episcopacy fully written out and authenticated. The very want of such authentication is the highest proof of the grandeur of those claims. A point of minor importance, such as the doctrine of

the atonement, might be set forth in explicit texts; but a point of such might, magnitude and glory, as the apostolical succession, scorns to be so confined; the world would not hold the books that should be written. Call for texts in proof of it? Who does not see the folly of such presumption? Texts to prove the apostolical succession? Why, the very foundation of your faith in it must be its utter uncertainty.

THIRD SOPHISM, IN REGARD TO THE NATURE OF THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.

(III.) Another sophism respects the nature of the ministerial office, and the dignity of the ministers of Christ, and assumes for them an origin and independency apart from the church and superior to it. I have even been accused of degrading the ministerial office, and derogating from my own dignity as a minister, because I have in a former lecture deduced the ministers of Christ from the church, from Christ's own sacred, blessed body! He can have read the New Testament to very little purpose, and must have magnified his office more than the Saviour and the church, who can possibly admit the conception that the ministers of Christ do not come from the church of Christ. The object in such an one's mind doubtless is this, namely, to make the ministry superior to the church, and the church dependent, not so much on Christ, as on the ministry. This is the essence of a Hierarchy, and this is the element of the Hierarchical Despotism. But I blush and am ashamed that any man, who has not the self-interest of prelatical dignity to blind him, and so

may be supposed to look with more impartiality upon the subject, should estimate the office of the ministry and the dignity of the minister, not by the service done to Christ's body in the enlarging and edifying of it, but by the lordship over that body! Shame on such a palpable manifestation of Hierarchical ambition!

We open the New Testament, and what do we find? Do we find the least sanction of this assumed superiority? "And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house, he asked them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? But they held their peace, for by the way they had disputed among themselves who should be the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all." The very first introduction of these Hierarchical propensities and pretensions produced an ambitious rivalry and quarrel in the very presence of the Saviour. "And he said, ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many! ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔστω ὑμῶν δοῦλος· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι, ἔστω ὑμῶν διάκονος." And what do you conceive to be the meaning of the word minister? Lord or governor, you will say, surely, according to the Hierarchical system. No such thing. The one of these words, διάκονος,

signifies a servant, a free serving man, the other δοῦλος, signifies a servant of all work, a slave. And our blessed Lord, to make the nature of the office more conspicuous as opposed to ambition and selfishness, and as consisting in doing good to others, says, he that will be great among you, let him be your διάκονος, but he that will be first of all, let him be your δοῦλος. So the essence of the ministry of Jesus Christ is benevolent service, serving others in doing them good, especially ministering to their spiritual good for Jesus' sake. This is the ministry, according as Christ himself came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. O wonderful love! O blessed example! There was a wide gulf between this ambitious quarrel among the disciples for lordship and supremacy, and that humility and love, with which afterwards they were made ready to wash one another's feet, and to lay down their own lives for each other in the work of the gospel.

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

And now let me ask, Where do the ministry come from, if not from the church? Was not the Apostle Paul in the church before he was in the ministry? And Timothy, was he not taken out of the church to be ordained as an Evangelist? And all true ministers of Christ, do they not, must they not of necessity, spring from the church, must they not be members of the body of Christ, before they can be prepared to minister to that body in spiritual things? Do they bear the church, or does the church bear them? Verily if a cohort of angels should bring a minister not of Christ's

church to any particular church, and propose him for ordination, it would be the duty of that church to reject him. A man *cannot be* a minister of Christ without first belonging to the Church of Christ. When our blessed Lord ascended on high and led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men, he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. But where did these gifts come from? From the church of Christ, by the selection of the Holy Spirit; from the church of Christ, every member of which is one of a Royal Priesthood. Christ needs not to look anywhere but unto his own churches for his own ministers. They are *from* the church, *for* the church.

The highest honor they can have is first, to belong themselves to the church of Jesus Christ, and second to be employed as servants of that church. This is their dignity; their authority is service, and the moment it passes into anything else, it is usurpation. They are not to be lords over God's heritage, but examples to the flock. They are not to have dominion over faith, but to be helpers of joy. Their rivalry is to be, not, who shall be Prime Minister of Christ in his kingdom, but, who shall most faithfully and self-forgettingly edify the body of Christ; who shall, with most humility of mind and many tears, go beyond his brethren in enduring hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ; in lowliness of mind, each esteeming other better than themselves. "In all things approving ourselves as the ministers of Christ, in much patience, in afflictions, in distresses, in necessities, in stripes, in im-

prisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left, by honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report, as deceivers and yet true, as unknown and yet well known, as dying and behold we live, as chastened, and not killed, as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing, as poor, yet making many rich, as having nothing and yet possessing all things." There is an apostolic succession for you; and we may be sure, if this had been the succession so vaunted by prelatists and worldly minds, it would never have been proclaimed in bishops' palaces; the possession of the apostolical succession would have been gladly relinquished and left to proscribed conventicles. Yes, the apostolical succession itself would have been the sign of heresy and schism, and not the want of it.

HIERARCHICAL VIEWS OF THE MINISTRY.

Now, I pray you, contrast with this view, which we cannot deny to be scriptural, the opinions cherished and the views entertained, by those who not only prefer lordship in the church, but who absolutely hold up the lunatic assertion, that there can be no church without that office and creature, a prelatical diocesan bishop. I will take a fair example. A sermon was preached not long since, by an episcopal clergyman of this city, from the following text, namely, "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." Now, if you will believe it,

this profound expositor took the word ministers to signify much the same as foreign ministers sent by a monarch with plenipotentiary powers to a foreign court. Of course, they are not in any way accountable to that court, and they must punctiliously stand upon all their rights, and dignities, and authorities of their office, the honor of their monarch requiring that his representative at a foreign court be a match for any grandee in pomp and circumstance of independent authority. Being not selected nor commissioned by the people or the State to whom he is sent, he has no accountability whatever to them for the manner in which his trust is performed, nor they any right whatever relative to him, to put him out of his office, but only the right and the duty to hear his message. In the case of the minister of Christ, I suppose he would add also the right and the duty of paying his expenses, supporting at court the establishment of the plenipotentiary, a thing which we never hear of foreign courts doing, even our plain Republic being obliged to look up the outfit and pay the salaries of the plenipotentiaries it sends abroad. We doubt if a more amusing example of the exposition of Scripture to bolster up the hierarchical despotism, could be found in all the Middle Ages than this. It is not necessary that we should dwell upon it to show its utter inconsistency with the description of the ministry in the gospel of Christ; but we must notice the almost ludicrous application made of the term ministers in the text, as if they were analogous to foreign ministers, and invested with the same powers. You will be not a little amused, when I tell you that the word in the text is ὑπηρέτας, servants, so that it follows that either

the preacher knowingly deceived his hearers in deducing from this passage the prerogatives of a foreign minister for the ministers of Christ, or he must have forgotten to look at the original, and absolutely supposed that the word would bear that meaning. The word itself is very striking. In reality, literally, it means the rower of a vessel under the captain, so that the ὑπηρέτας, the ministers of Christ, so far from being here represented as foreign plenipotentiaries, are represented as laborious rowers of that sacred vessel, the Church of Christ; his servants, by whose honored labor the vessel of the Church is rowed onward in her course.

In conformity with this, the Apostle Paul says, "We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." There are but two passages in which the word ambassador is used, one of them in Ephesians vi. 20, where Paul says, that for the gospel he is an ambassador in bonds; and the other in second Cor. v. 20, where Paul says that the ministers of Christ are ambassadors to *beseech* men to be reconciled to God. There seem to have been some persons, even in Paul's own day, dissatisfied with this remarkable humility of the apostle. They thought he degraded his office in making himself the servant of all. They demanded that their minister should assume more dignity, glory, lordship, authority, magnificence; and they were so fond of it, that rather than not enjoy the spectacle, they were willing it should be exercised over themselves. And Paul had to excuse himself to them for being so economical in his habits, and for taking so little of the airs of authority upon him. He

was not burdensome to them. Forgive me, said he, this wrong. There were men glorying after the flesh, whom the Corinthians were delighted with on account of their proud pretensions. Such puffing and swelling in the ministers made the people think themselves much greater than before. They were delighted with such foolery. "Ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise. For ye suffer it, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face." Never was depicted more to the life the characteristics of pretension and aggrandizement on the one side, and cringing servility and admiration on the other. And what was the consequence? Just what Paul feared; debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults.

THE MINISTRATION OF THE SPIRIT NOT AN APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

In the early simplicity of Christianity, ministers sprang *from* the church *for* the church, and so must they ever do. It might be doubted if in the whole first century of Christianity there was a single instance in which any church possessed a minister, who was not at first one of its own simple members. When men became, by the new creation of the Holy Spirit, Christians, they had in themselves the germ of future ministers. If they desired the office of a bishop, they might, if need be, become bishops, on being proved to possess the simple holy qualifications enumerated by Paul. So far as they were faithful Christians, they were all

preachers of the word. It had been promised by the Lord Jesus that not apostles merely, but believers, should speak with tongues. It had been promised in the Old Testament, that not to Priests and Levites, should public spiritual gifts, or the privilege of exercising them be restricted, but that upon all should the Spirit be poured out; sons and daughters, young men and old, even servants and hand-maidens should see visions and prophesy; this should be the ministration no longer of a Levitical, nor an apostolical succession, but the ministration of the Spirit, a new, free, glorious dispensation. And so it was, and so it came to pass. And hence, hardly three years had elapsed, and the first Christian church in the world, the church at Jerusalem, had but become established and numerous, under the government and teaching of the Apostles, when, except the Apostles, they were all scattered abroad throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, PREACHING THE WORD. They went even to Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch. Who were they, and what was their commission as preachers of the gospel? They were simple Christians, but they were the royal priesthood of Jesus Christ. No hand of Levite, priest, or bishop had touched them, but the Spirit of the Lord God was upon them, and they were all preachers, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

And this was the way in which the Lord Jesus had determined beforehand to form and spread the Christian church; not by a Levitical mould in a new form to be called the apostolical succession, but by the unfettered freedom of the dispensation of the Spirit; not by men on whom the Apostles' hands had been laid, or who

had been commissioned by the Apostles, as if through them alone was to descend the unction of a new priesthood, but by men who, in their own right as Christians, though every one of the Apostles had died as soon as the church at Jerusalem was formed, were kings and priests unto God; by simple Christians, simple members of the church, some of whom perhaps had not even begun to exercise their gifts in the social meetings of their own native church, who had been never dreamed of by the Apostles as preachers, far less set apart by any imaginable form of consecration. But it took the fire of a persecution to make them understand this free and sublime genius of the new dispensation. They would have continued fettered by the narrow genius of Judaism; they would very likely have established a Hierarchical church on the old ambitious foundation, and a new Levitico-Apostolico-Christian order; they might have appointed one of the Apostles as the High Priest, and so the first Pope would have been elected not at Rome, but at Jerusalem; and the bugbear of apostolical succession would have been among the first, as it was among the latest of the corruptions of Christianity. Such, I say, would in all probability have been the consequences of numbers, indolence, ambition, and worldly prosperity. Had they stayed much longer at Jerusalem, the old quarrel for supremacy between Zebedee's children and the rest of the disciples would in all probability have broken out anew, and that strife for lordship, which constituted the essence of the Hierarchical Despotism for ages, would have begun on the spot where our blessed Lord washed his disciples' feet.

But He who knoweth what is in man, and who per-

haps already saw the germinations of ecclesiastical ambition in this great successful church in Jerusalem, and that those many thousand disciples had forgotten for what purpose they were called, even to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, interposed in his providence, and permitted a violent persecution to scatter them in every direction, preaching the word. So they had to go, unfortunate, uncommissioned men, without the benefit of the apostolical succession. Not one of them could show a license, not one possessed an Apostolical Diploma, and (most melancholy defalcation) except the six persons who had been appointed to settle the pecuniary difficulties between the Grecians and the Hebrews, not one had ever the hand of an Apostle laid on him. Nevertheless, forth they went, and that persecution, in the formation of churches as independent as the church at Jerusalem, put a stop to the Hierarchical Despotism for more than two hundred years. They went everywhere, preaching the word. How greatly it is to be lamented, that as they were busied from region to region gaining converts and gathering churches, some incarnation of the modern apostolical succession could not have been present to denounce such assemblies as unhallowed conventicles, and to say, There can be no church without a Bishop! They went everywhere, preaching the word. Who were these men, that thus dared to preach out of the regular line of apostolical succession? Some of them were carpenters, and some were tent-makers, and some were armorers, and others were tanners, and others were fishermen, and tax-gatherers. Some were Greeks, some Jews, some Romans. Some of them

were from Cyprus and Cyrene, and coming to the city of Antioch, these men, having a kindness to their countrymen, preached to the Grecians—preached the Lord Jesus; they preached, though never ordained, and what is more, the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord. Here then was a church, and here were ministers, neither of whom had ever in their lives looked upon that thing of modern Hierarchical worship, a bishop.

But what I wish now to speak of particularly is the fact that these preachers, these ministers of Christ, sprang out of the church. When the disciples from Jerusalem had, by the Spirit of God, gained a sufficient number of converts, they formed churches, and out of these churches were chosen the future ministers of these churches. They were chosen, without any question, in the same way in which the Apostles at Jerusalem had set the example of such selections, when men were to be appointed for office, by the brethren of the church looking out among themselves such men as were signalized for faith and the gifts of the Spirit, and appointing such to be their overseers. So the churches were not only churches while without bishops, but they made their own bishops. And those that did not do so in the first instance, or were content for some time mutually to worship and edify one another as the Spirit gave them utterance, did so afterwards, at the instance of Barnabas and Paul. It was not Barnabas and Paul, it was not any of the Apostles who selected for the churches men to be their teachers; it was the churches themselves, who chose for themselves, out of their own number, such men as they had found endowed with

the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and these men were made their elders. In that same church at Antioch were prophets and teachers, on whom no apostles' hands had ever been laid in consecration. These men were not the less the ministers of Christ for that.

THE HIERARCHICAL VIEW OF THE MINISTRY CORRUPT AND UNSCRIPTURAL.

Through the influence of the Hierarchical Despotism there has, in fact, come to be a complete corruption in men's ideas in regard to the relative power and position of the ministry and the church. It is the church which is the body of Christ, and the ministry come out of it. The church does not come out of the ministry, but out of Christ; the church does not depend upon the ministry for its existence, but upon Christ. So far from its being, in any sense whatever, true, that there can be no church without a bishop, the truth is, that there can be no bishop, no minister, pastor, elder, without a church. A preacher of the gospel there might be, before there was any church in existence; the very first person converted by the Saviour might have been made by him a preacher of the gospel, before there was another believer in existence. But such an one could not be a bishop, an elder, without a church, in and over which alone there could be the office of a bishop. The order is evidently this; first believers, then preachers of the gospel, then churches, then bishops or elders. Where there are believers, there, in the highest, most universal, most glorious sense, is the church of Christ, and preachers of the gospel must come out of that church, and bishops and

elders must come out of that church, and not that church out of bishops. Wherever there are believers in Christ, there, in those believers, are the ministers of Christ, if he chooses them as such; and he chooses them, or none. They are a royal priesthood, a peculiar people, to show forth his praises, and of them, and for them, he chooses his overseers of the flock.

This, it is manifest, is the view taken by the Apostle Peter, when he says to believers, "Ye are built up, a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth." The exhortations are given to believers in general, besides his exhortations to the elders, to feed the flock of God. To the same general purpose is that passage in the epistle to the Philippians, "And many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear." To the same purpose is that declaration in the Revelation of John, "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come." There is nothing clearer than this, that the members of the primitive apostolic churches, just so far as they were faithful to Christ, all considered themselves, everywhere, as in a most important sense preachers of the

word; and such preachers were the precious stuff out of which bishops or elders were made. The overseers and preachers of the church came out of the church, and not the church out of its overseers. So that if, at any time, the whole ministry had been swept away by death, a new ministry could be raised out of that body of Christ whence the first ministry emanated. Hence it is not necessary to maintain an uninterrupted succession in the ministry; and, in point of fact, it can be shown, that there has not been such an uninterrupted succession; there having been a long and dreary night and chaos of wickedness in the undisputed reign of Antichrist, in which it cannot be proved that any of those called the ministers of Christ were ever employed in that work which constitutes the office of the ministry, preaching the word. But a succession of true believers might exist, the church of Christ might exist, though all the so-called ministers of Christ were wolves in sheep's clothing. And it is the church, of which Christ has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and out of the church Christ can, in the darkest times, as among the Waldenses, raise up faithful witnesses and preachers, though no human hand was ever laid upon them in ordination. The continued existence of the church is a security of the succession of the ministry; and not the succession of the ministry a security of the existence of the church. The existence of the church depends upon the word and the Spirit of God; and the existence of the ministry depends on the existence of the church, and must come out of the church.

FOURTH SOPHISM CONNECTED WITH THE WORD ORDINATION.

(IV.) The next point of sophistry to be noted respects the word ordination, which hoary, hierarchical usage has as much entangled and furbelowed with sea-weed as the word bishop. The absurd ideas prevalent in regard to it, and the usages founded thereon, so contrary to the usage of the primitive churches, make it a matter of great importance to go to the bottom, and find what it really means. The ambition of hierarchists and churchmen has attached so many solemn fungi to the simplicity of the faith of the Gospel, that, in cutting them away, you seem, to some minds, as if you were cutting away the Gospel itself. If a man, having an enormous wen hanging at the end of his nose, should succeed in persuading himself and others, that this wen was the perfection of humanity, and that all men's noses ought to be made to hang out in such a bag-like excrescence, this nasal fanaticism could not be a greater absurdity, than the pretence that prelates are essentials to the being of a church, or prelatical ordination to the being of the Christian ministry.

I shall show, first, that ordination by laying on of hands is not necessary to constitute a Christian minister; second, that ordination by other Christian ministers is not necessary to constitute such a minister; and, third, that the appointment of one of their own number by any Christian church, in accordance with the requisites for the character of a bishop laid down in Paul's epistle to Timothy, is all that *is* necessary to constitute a true Heaven-commissioned Christian min-

ister. I shall show these points one by one with the utmost clearness.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN EXPEDIENCY AND DIVINE RIGHT.

But here let it be distinctly marked, that I distinguish between what may be deemed expedient by different churches, and under different forms of church polity, and what can be shown to be *necessary* from the Word of God; between what may be deemed necessary now, as a matter of expediency, precaution, or otherwise, and what was evidently necessary as a matter of inspiration and divine authority. The Presbyterians may, for centuries, have adopted a form of government which, among themselves, makes ordination by other ministers necessary to the ministerial commission. And hence it would be the highest disorder for any man among them to assume that commission without such ordination. The Congregationalists may have adopted a similar order, so that it would be disorderly and injurious not to adhere to it. The Episcopalians may have adopted a similar order, restricting, however, the whole essence of the ministerial function to the virtue hidden in the palm of a prelatical bishop. But ordination in neither of these forms is essential to the Christian ministry, because, in neither of them can it be shown to be of divine obligation, of the nature of a divine precept.

MEANING OF THE WORD ORDINATION.

Now, first, as to the sophism connected with the word ordination: the idea commonly connected with it is

that of a mysterious transfer of gifts, powers, functions, the passing of a sort of ecclesiastical electricity in that transaction, not received, possessed, or experienced before. Would any of my hearers, accustomed at all to the hierarchical use of the word ordain, or ordination, ever dream that the meaning of the word in the New Testament is simply and solely appoint, or appointment? We have come very generally to signify by it the ceremony of inauguration into the office of the ministry, or investiture therewith. But disintegrated from all hierarchical excrescences, and reduced to its New Testament simplicity, it means simply *appointment;* and this, first, either by divine authority, special, extraordinary, or by the choice of the churches, or, lastly, by such choice with the ratification of the miraculously endowed officers of the New Testament churches. But that there are no directions whatever as to any mode of ordination, which was to be binding on the churches, any particular mode as fixed of God, is so clear, that the most fanatical hierarchists have never pretended that there were.

ORDINATION IN THE WORD *Καθιστημι.*

The two principal words, from which our English word "ordain" is derived in this connection, are these, namely, *καθίστημι* and *χειροτονέω.* The first of these words occurs in Titus i. 5, *καταστησῇς, appoint* elders in every city; and means simply *appoint, establish,* or, if you please, *set in office.* But no form, no ceremony, is included in the meaning, or connected with it. There is nothing of the prelatical signification of

the word ordain. Titus was no Bishop, never ordained as such, but a special, extraordinary assistant of the Apostle, commissioned and endowed by him to act in his place, and do what he would have done, as an extraordinary officer of Christ, with extraordinary powers as an Evangelist, in the establishment and arrangement of government, order and discipline in the infant churches. That done, his own office and authority were not to be perpetuated, plainly, because they would no longer be needed; so that, whereas Titus was to appoint elders in every city, he was not to appoint Evangelists, not any such extraordinary officers as his own office of special assistance to the Apostles, nor was any provision to be made, nor were any directions given, for the future appointment or perpetuity of such offices, nor in point of fact were any such directions *ever* given, or any such offices *ever* established.

Titus evidently had the same office as Timothy, and neither of them, there is the least reason to believe, were ever ordained Bishops; both were extraordinary fellow-laborers with the Apostles, of whose precise office, that no pattern was to be left in the churches, is perfectly plain, in that none was left, nor any directions given, nor any powers committed to any persons for this purpose. No person would dare take upon himself this authority of Titus, without precisely the same commission as Titus; and that it was felt and acknowledged as an extraordinary commission is manifest, in that no person contemporary with, or after him, did take upon himself the same commission. No one person pretended to have or to exercise a similar

authority in appointing elders. And every man in his senses must have reasoned thus: If Paul had meant that other persons in succession should exercise the authority of Titus, he would necessarily have added, as he was careful to do in regard to the truth of the gospel to be preached, This same power of appointing elders, and this same power of setting in order the things that are wanting, commit thou to another person also, with a commandment to him to commit it to his successor: and this would have been the perfection of the Hierarchical Despotism to begin with; this would have been to constitute the infant church as a consummate finished Papacy. For the power of appointing the officers of any body or polity, is supreme power over that body or polity.

We do not, however, admit, that even in the case of Titus this word, *καταστησῇς*, signifies in him supreme authority, but, as is proved by the usage of the New Testament churches, and by the custom of the Apostles in their own exercise of this authority, an appointment by and with the consent of the churches; the churches signifying whom they would have to be their ministers, their elders, what persons there were proved among them to be men of faith and blameless, whom the Apostles then inaugurated in their office, ratifying with prayer the choice of the body of believers. This same word, *καθίστημι*, is used in Acts vi. 3, in a way which proves this allegation. And this was manifestly necessary, inasmuch as the Apostles, in passing among the churches to ordain elders, could not be supposed, without an immediate miraculous revelation from God, to know what persons in the churches had been proved

blameless and suitable for the office. And that they did not rely upon such miraculous revelation in such cases is clear from Acts vi. 3, where, in a matter of much less moment, and in a case which would inevitably, in some respects, constitute a precedent for the after usage of the churches in the appointment of officers, they said to the multitude of the brethren, *Look ye out among yourselves* men suitable to the office; relying not upon their own inspiration, nor claiming any power of appointment by themselves, but appealing to the people, the brethren, the church, the honored body of Christ. Of course the Spirit of Christ always dwells in that body, and guides it, and the wisdom of selection and the authority of appointment must always dwell in that body under its Great Head; and its officers must spring out from itself, according to its own wants, and the dictate of its Head; just as the hand springs from the body, and is not attached to it, or set upon it, by a foreign creation, by a separate power.

So much for the meaning of ordination in that word *καθίστημι*. It is simply an appointment, and no transfer or communication of ministerial power, or ministerial inspiration, or ministerial holiness, or ministerial gifts in any way. It is a simple appointment, on the ground of those gifts having been observed as an endowment by the Holy Spirit, in persons thus marked and sealed as it were, as suitable subjects of such appointment. It is no transfer, or communication of such gifts, nor any transfer of any power of office; for God has not committed the power of making such a transfer to any individual; the power is in the office, if a

person be appointed to it, but it does not and cannot pass over to the person from other persons, as a hidden, invisible, mysterious conveyance. Nothing of the kind takes place. The person appointed to the office, receives such power in the office from the Lord Jesus Christ, and not from the persons appointing him; if they choose to give him a power over themselves, which is not in the office, very well; if any particular church, in selecting and appointing a minister on the ground of certain ministerial qualifications evidently possessed, should say, in addition to the power connected by the Lord Jesus with the office of the ministry for our edification and not for our destruction, we commit to you supreme authority over our church edifice and rites of worship, to alter or increase the same at your pleasure; this would be a totally different thing; but this does not belong to the office. This is a particular agreement, which any particular church may make, if it pleases, with its minister; any particular church polity may even incorporate such a thing into its "standards," as they are called, in any article drawn up in regard to its ministry; but this can never touch the office of a minister of Christ, can never be incorporated with it, though all the "standards" of all the churches in the world were to insist upon it.

ORDINATION AS INDICATED BY THE WORD *Χειροτονέω*.

We come to the next word applied to the appointment, or as we say ordination of elders in the New Testament, *χειροτονήσαντες*, and the examination of it invincibly strengthens and confirms our argument on the

word used in the Epistle to Titus, καταστήσῃς. For, the meaning of this word, χειροτονέω, is, incontrovertibly, to choose by holding up the hands, to choose and appoint by vote, and so, to ordain, appoint, constitute. The use of the word connects it with popular suffrage. So it is used in 2 Cor. viii. 19, of the appointment of those persons who were *chosen of the Churches* to travel with Paul, χειροτονηθείς. In the other place, Acts xiv. 23, where it is used of the appointment of elders in the churches, the selection of this particular word most manifestly points to the choice of the churches, as the mode in which Barnabas and Saul appointed those officers. The literal interpretation is this, namely, And when they had appointed for them by vote elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, &c. Or, as it is the participle, χειροτονήσαντες, it would be a more literal rendering to say, Selecting or appointing for them by vote, &c. As to the manner of this election Calvin remarks on 2 Cor. viii. 19, as follows:— *Notanda autem est species electionis, χειροτονία scilicet Græcis usitata: in qua præibant auctoritate et consilio primores, totamque actionem gubernabant: plebs autem sciscebat:* It was the manner customary in Greece in which, the leaders or nobles presided over the whole transaction, and the people voted.

MANNER OF BARNABAS AND SAUL IN APPOINTING ELDERS.

Just thus, without any question, was the manner of Barnabas and Saul in the appointment of elders. We argue powerfully that it was, from the instance of

appointment in Acts vi. 3, where the word is καταστήσομεν, but the appointment was by the choice of the brethren. Much more here, where the word used is that which was always applied to the act of choosing by vote, does the appointment of elders by Barnabas and Saul point to the same mode of popular suffrage. There was, at that time, too much Christian confidence and love to proceed otherwise, and it is evident that even if Paul had felt as if he could with propriety, by virtue of the authority given him by the Lord Jesus, appoint elders without consultation or choice of the people, he would not have done it. He would have chosen rather to show his trust in them as Christians, and leave it with them to select for their rulers those whom they would approve, and their choice he would sanction. Indeed, if an assembly of Christians, with the Divine Spirit in their hearts and the love of Christ guiding them, are not to be trusted with the choice, and so with the appointment, of their ministers, much less are one or two or a few individuals to be so trusted. The appointment of elders apart from the choice of the people was not an act of sovereignty likely to be assumed by Paul, nor in point of fact was it assumed by any of the Apostles, it being the universal custom in that age, and the age following, for the people to choose their own clergy. Of the interference of a bishop, or bench of bishops, they knew nothing. Ordination with them was simple appointment to office, and no mysterious sacramental transfer of sacredness.

You will remark, that in the ordination of elders by Barnabas and Saul, there was no laying on of hands; a fact sufficient of itself to prove our first allegation,

that the laying on of hands is not necessary to the office of a Christian Minister, nor any necessary part of his induction into such office. Nor is there any instance in the New Testament, in which Christian Ministers, or Presbyters, or Bishops, ever were so inducted into office. It will not do to *conjecture* that they were so inducted; you may conjecture that in the case of the appointment of elders by Barnabas and Saul, they laid their hands on them, but there is not the least ground for supposing that they did. You might just as well *conjecture* that they poured a flask of consecrated oil upon their heads, and you would have just as much argument to support the supposition. If they had done either, it would in all probability have been mentioned. Some things are mentioned which they did do, as fasting and praying, but there is no word of the laying on of hands. Now as there is always so much particularity in mentioning this ceremony, wherever it took place, we have the strongest ground for concluding that as it is never mentioned in connection with the ordination of elders, it never did take place. And still more certainly do we come to the conclusion that if it is not mentioned at all, it is not mentioned as necessary, not delivered as a binding ceremony, without which a minister of Christ cannot be a minister. That the elders laid their hands on Timothy, for his appointment to office, is clear; but that the laying on of Timothy's or Paul's hands, was necessary to constitute an elder, is nowhere asserted, and nowhere intimated.

CASES OF TIMOTHY AND TITUS.

The idea of the ordination of Timothy and Titus, as bishops, seems to have originated in the spurious addition appended to Paul's epistles to them, stating that they were ordained first bishops of Ephesus and Crete. There is not the least reason to suppose that either of them was ever ordained bishop, or considered as such. Bishops, in the prelatical, episcopal sense, they could not have been, for such an office was not then in existence, and the word ἐπίσκοπος will bear no such meaning, being precisely the same as πρεσβύτερος. Neither is there the least reason to suppose that they were ever ordained bishops or elders in the New Testament sense, but many reasons which forbid such a supposition, which forbid the supposition that they were connected with any particular church whatsoever. Nevertheless, the word used in the appendage to the epistles of Paul most strongly confirms our argument as to the manner of the ordination of elders or bishops by popular suffrage, that word being, in each case, χειροτονηθέντα, appointed by vote. Whatever office it was to which the writer supposes Timothy and Titus to have been ordained, the ordination was evidently a popular appointment, and not a presentation by a bishop.

In regard to those spurious subscriptions, from which principally has arisen the idea of Timothy and Titus being bishops of Ephesus and Crete, I need only quote what Dr. Paley says of them in his admirable work, the Horæ Paulinæ. "Six of these subscriptions," says he, "are false or improbable; that is, they are either contradicted by the contents of the epistle, or are diffi-

cult to be reconciled with them." Among these six he reckons those to the first epistle to Timothy, and the epistle to Titus.

"The First Epistle to Timothy the subscription asserts to have been sent from Laodicea; yet, when St. Paul writes, 'I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, *πορευόμενος εἰς Μακέδονιαν* (when I set out for Macedonia'), the reader is naturally led to conclude, that he wrote the letter upon his arrival in that country.

"The Epistle to Titus is dated from Nicopolis in Macedonia, whilst no city of that name is known to have existed in that province.

"The use, and the only use, which I make of these observations, is to show how easily errors and contradictions steal in where the writer is not guided by original knowledge. There are only eleven distinct assignments of date to St. Paul's Epistles (for the four written from Rome may be considered as plainly contemporary); and of these, six seem to be erroneous. I do not attribute any authority to these subscriptions. I believe them to have been conjectures, founded sometimes upon loose traditions, but more generally upon a consideration of some particular text, without sufficiently comparing it with other parts of the epistle, with different epistles, or with the history. Suppose, then, that the subscriptions had come down to us as authentic parts of the epistles, there would have been more contrarieties and difficulties arising out of these final verses, than from all the rest of the volume. Yet, if the epistles had been forged, the whole must have been made up of the same elements as those of which the subscriptions are composed, viz., tradition, conjecture, and inference; and it would have remained to be accounted for how, whilst so many errors were crowded into the concluding clauses of the letters, so much consistency should be preserved in other parts."

Timothy is known to have been an Evangelist. Of

the manner of his appointment to that office we have no account; but we have the mention, by Paul, of peculiar gifts which were in him by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, and the laying on of Paul's own hands. Thus, in 1 Tim. iv. 14, it is said, "Neglect not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hand of the Presbytery." And in 2 Tim. i. 6, it is said, "That thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Now, on the comparison of these with other passages, where the laying on of hands is mentioned, especially Acts viii. 17, 20, and Acts xix. 6, we have the same expression as is used by Paul to Timothy, *the gift of God;* and we find it was such an ostensible gift of the Holy Ghost, doubtless in miraculous power, that Simon Magus desired to purchase it with money. It was certainly not the ordinary spiritual influences of the Holy Spirit; for it was a gift in addition to those influences, it being baptized believers on whom it was conferred; and it was something that gave extraordinary power, which tempted Simon Magus to try and purchase it. How many bishoprics have been bought in the same manner! And how many persons in the so-called apostolical succession have been merely in the succession of simony, receiving the pretended gift from men in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity! Indeed, the succession of Simon Magus can be far more clearly established in the church, than that of the Apostles.

In the second passage, from Acts xix. 1—6, we have a still more explicit interpretation of the nature of that gift of the Holy Ghost thus communicated by

the laying on of hands. For, first, it is *disciples* who already possessed the ordinary converting influences of the Holy Spirit, to whom it was given; and second, it is said expressly, that "when Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; *and they spake with tongues and prophesied.*" This then was the gift which Simon Magus desired to purchase, and this was one of the gifts which was in Timothy by the laying on of Paul's hands. But there is not a single passage, which intimates that the laying on of the Apostles' hands was necessary for ministerial ordination. Much more did it never convey the converting influences of the Holy Spirit. Where there was faith already, it evidently conveyed a miraculous power.

CASES OF BARNABAS AND SAUL.

Several other passages remain to be examined, from which it is evident, first, that so far as the laying on of hands constituted any kind of ordination, it was performed indiscriminately by apostles, prophets, teachers and lay Christians; a fact fatal to the assumption of the power of ordination by any one class; second, that it was not essential to the office of a preacher of the gospel; third, that there were men publicly recognized as preachers, of whom there is no reason whatever to believe that any form of ordination whatever was practised in regard to them.

The first of these passages is Acts xiii. 1—3, "Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas and Simeon, that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen,

which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and *laid their hands on them*, they sent them away." From this passage it is proved, first, that simple prophets and teachers, of whom there is no reason whatever to suppose that they had ever received themselves any ordination from any apostle or apostles, or bishops or elders, or any officers at all, could themselves ordain others. From a comparison of Acts xi. 19, 20, this Lucius of Cyrene seems to have been one of the members of the Church at Jerusalem scattered abroad by the persecution, and like the other members of that Church, preaching the word. He had had no ordination himself, but with his fellow prophets and teachers, was called upon by the Holy Ghost to ordain Barnabas and Saul.

It is proved, second, from this passage, that ordination was not necessary to constitute ministers of Christ, for Barnabas and Saul were both evidently ministers, *before* they themselves received this ordination. They were ministers, and had acted as ministers for a long time. Paul had preached at Damascus and in other places, and Barnabas, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, had had much people added to the Lord under his own ministry. But there is no hint that either of them had been ordained. If, however, it be asserted that Paul had received such ordination, then the examination of the passage, in which it is recorded, is likewise fatal to the hypothesis of Episcopalians, and completely oversets from its foundation the assumption

that ordination can be performed only by men in the ministry, or in the apostolical succession; for this first ordination of Paul was by a layman! The passage is in Acts ix. 10—20. We now proceed to the examination of it, and we find it perfectly fatal to the assumptions of Episcopalians in every shape.

It seems from this passage that there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias. There were other disciples at Damascus, but they do not seem, as yet, to have separated themselves from the Jewish Synagogues, or to have been constituted into a church. They were simply disciples, having no office whatever, but to be lay-preachers, as all the disciples were, holding forth the word of life as they had opportunity. Ananias was simply a disciple, having no commission from the Apostles, no ordination in any way, and perhaps having never seen an apostle. But he was a disciple of Christ. To this man Paul was sent, that he might receive ordination, and be, by this disciple, baptized! The account of both ceremonies is as follows: "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house, and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized."

Now comparing this passage with Paul's own account of the transaction, in the 22d chapter of Acts, you have additional evidence of the relation of the parties, and some proof that Paul himself looked back

to this transaction as his own setting apart to the ministry. View it in whatever way you choose, it is fatal to the hypothesis of Episcopacy. If you say that he *was* ordained, then it is evident that an apostle was ordained by a layman, and what happened in one case might happen in another. If you say that he was *not* ordained, then he entered on his ministry and exercised it without any ordination; or, if that later transaction was his ordination a number of years afterwards, when with Barnabas he was set apart by the prophets and teachers in Antioch, then again you have the ordination of an apostle by those who had not themselves been ordained. The difficulty is inextricable, the case utterly subversive of all pretensions to an apostolical succession.

CASE OF THE SEVEN APPOINTED TO SERVE TABLES.

The next instance of ordination to which our argument brings us, is the first on record, and exceedingly important, as showing, even in a case in which there was the laying on of hands by the Apostles, that the appointment was by the popular vote, and not a prelatical presentation. This was the appointment in Acts vi. 1—6, of seven persons who were to settle a quarrel between the Grecians and the Hebrews, and to take charge of the business of the daily distribution of the moneys of the common stock. This was the special business, with which the Apostles themselves would not be burdened, and therefore called upon the brethren of the church to look out from themselves seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wis-

dom, whom they might appoint over this business. Accordingly, they proceeded to the election, and chose seven persons, among whom were Stephen and Philip, and on whom the Apostles laid their hands and prayed. The officers thus created are nowhere called deacons; they might rather be called treasurers, for they were chosen for the one particular purpose of looking after the pecuniary distributions. For Episcopalians to assert, as they do, that here is an authority for their third order in the ministry, is precisely to do the work of forgery with the sacred oracles. It is just as if a man, having a ten pound note in his possession (£10) should deliberately sit down and add a cypher (£100), and then pass it for a hundred pounds. For, the advocates of episcopacy take here an appointment for a specified charge and business, no way connected with the Christian ministry, and make out of it for themselves another order in that ministry! But these men were neither appointed to preach, nor were hands laid on them in token of any transfer of ministerial power; nor was this laying on of hands a transmission to them of the gift of the Holy Ghost; for it was performed in regard to those who were already full of the Holy Ghost, eminent for their gifts and graces, and who must have exercised those gifts and graces, in order to have been known as thus eminent. And they continued to exercise them, but not specially in consequence of this ordination, for they were abundantly fitted to teach and to preach Jesus. And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people. He preached the gospel with a power that was irresistible, but evidently not in

consequence of his ordination, which was an appointment to a business totally different from that of preaching.

Just so it was with Philip. There was no second ordination of this individual, that we are informed of, and in this first ordination he was not appointed a preacher; and yet in the persecution that followed upon the death of Stephen, he went down to Samaria and preached Christ there. And so were the whole church scattered abroad, and went everywhere, PREACHING THE WORD. All the ordination they had was the sacred fire of persecution burning upon them, but they were preachers of the gospel, they were ministers of Christ, and some of them, as we have seen, were afterwards employed in appointing or ordaining Barnabas and Saul to their special mission among the churches. So much honor will God set upon the gifts and graces of his own Spirit; for it was these gifts and graces, that made these men prophets and teachers, and no act of human appointment or ordination. And it was these gifts in them, and not any previous ordination, which marked them as the instruments of the Holy Spirit in sealing, marking, setting apart, ordaining, if you please, the two ministers of Christ, Barnabas and Saul, for the work to which God had called them.

THE CASE OF APOLLOS CONSIDERED, BEING BY ITSELF ALONE A REFUTATION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS OF EPISCOPACY.

There is one passage more, of sufficient importance in our argument to note at length, and that contains

the history of Apollos, a minister of Christ without any ordination by any other ministers, indeed, without any ordination whatever, but ranked by Paul himself as being as much a minister as he was. The passage is in Acts xviii. 24—28, compared with Acts xix. 1, and I. Corinthians iii. 5. Apollos was an eloquent Jew of Alexandria, a disciple of John the Baptist, mighty in the Scriptures, and though only partially instructed in the way of the Lord, yet a fervent, diligent, powerful preacher. He certainly had never met any one of the Apostles, for he knew nothing but the baptism of John; he was without ordination, for not a single minister of Christ had met him, until he came to Ephesus, where Paul had left Aquila, likewise a Jew, with his wife Priscilla, who afterwards had a church in their house in Rome. The moment Apollos came to Ephesus, he began to teach in the synagogues; and then Aquila and Priscilla, having listened to him and noted his fervid eloquence, took him, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly. This, manifestly, was the only approximation to an ordination, that this man ever had, this exposition and instruction by the tent-maker Aquila and his wife. But under the guidance of the Holy Spirit he exercised his gifts for the edification of believers. And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote (the brethren, mark you, and no bishops), exhorting the disciples to receive him; that is, the Corinthian disciples, Paul having recently spent a year and a half in Corinth, so that there were many believers. To Corinth, therefore, Apollos came, and helped the brethren much, which had believed through grace, for

he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ.

Now here, clearly, was a distinguished minister of Christ without ordination. He knew nothing of the apostolical succession; he did not even know a single apostle; no prelatical hand had been laid upon him. Poor man! He was out of the line of the succession, and yet a powerful minister of Jesus Christ! But perhaps some one may ask, How do you know but that Paul himself may have ordained Apollos? And here our argument is perfect, and the refutation of the episcopal hypothesis, with its arrogant assumption, complete and entire; for Paul calls Apollos a minister of Christ before he had even seen or known him, calls him a minister at the time when, after the instructions he received from Aquila and Priscilla, he passed over into Corinth and preached Christ there. Referring to that very preaching of Apollos in Corinth, which under God had produced much fruit in men converted, Paul asks, Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but MINISTERS, by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?

Now a more triumphant refutation of the absurd dogma of the apostolical succession or ordination could not be conceived than this, out of the mouth of the Holy Scriptures. For here is a man, whom Paul declares to be, like himself, a minister of Christ, concerning whom we do really know that he never received ordination at all, much less from any apostle, or any man or men ordained by an apostle. Yet he was as much a minister of Christ as Paul was, and if any church had chosen him as one of their bishops or elders, it would have needed no other ap-

pointment for his ordination; this appointment itself was an ordination. There might have been, and there might not have been, after it, in concurrence with it, prayer and fasting on the part of the presbytery; but the appointment would have been the ordination, for ordination means appointment, nothing else; and Apollos, being a minister of Christ before such appointment or ordination, could not have been any more a minister of Christ after such appointment or ordination. If, in token and recognition of such appointment, the hands of the presbytery had been laid upon him, it could not have been for the conveyance of any ministerial gifts or qualifications, for he had them all before, as completely as Paul himself. Nor can it be shown from any passage whatever, that Paul and Barnabas, or any other persons, in appointing or ordaining elders in the churches, ever laid hands upon them. There is not a solitary instance, in which this ceremony is mentioned as accompanying the ordination of elders. And certainly when pastors are ordained now, the laying on of hands cannot be shown to have anything essential in it whatever. It conveys nothing, for the gift of miracles does not follow it; and the converting gift of the Holy Ghost is not conveyed with it, nor ever was, nor ever will be. In the time of the Apostles it certainly conveyed not the right or privilege of preaching the gospel, for this was conceded without it; and from the 12th, 13th and 14th chapters of the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, it is clear beyond all contradiction, that the members of the church indiscriminately preached and spake with tongues. "Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all be

comforted. Wherefore, brethren, covet not to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues."

These facts, now reasoned from, give no scope whatever to that wildness of modern radicalism, which would break down the distinctions between the ministry and the church of Christ. I am simply showing, from the way in which the primitive churches of Christ arose, and from the incontrovertible fact that there were preachers of the gospel, admitted and acknowledged as such, without ordination by the Apostles, the absurdity, nay, the impossibility of the assumed apostolical succession, and of the connected assumption that there can be no church without a bishop. The order of the ministry being established by Christ, no man may, in reckless presumption and disregard of appointed forms and requisite qualifications, rush into it; and there is a wide distinction between preaching the gospel, and being made by the Holy Ghost the overseer or bishop of a particular church. Whatever forms are laid down in the gospel are to be sacredly adhered to; nor can any man, unauthorized, assume to himself the dignity, the privileges, or the office of a minister of Christ.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCHES APPLIED TO TEST THE DOGMA, NO CHURCH WITHOUT A BISHOP.

There is one other form, of very great power, in which we may state our argument, occasioned by the assertion of the prelatists, founded on the sophisms which I have endeavored to expose, that there can be no

church without a bishop, meaning a prelatical or diocesan bishop, the oyster, and not the pearl. The assertion is most recklessly and inadvertently unrestricted, so that it runs back to the earliest period of the Christian dispensation. Now there are none but must admit that what was a church then may be a church now; and therefore if we could find but one single church in the New Testament without a bishop, yet recognized of the Holy Spirit as a church, this would be fatal to the assertion and assumption of prelatical episcopacy. To determine this matter we must turn to the New Testament, and examine the constitution of the churches there.

THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM.

Take then, first of all, the church at Jerusalem. Take it at the first moment in which it is named, Acts ii. 47, And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved. There was, at this time, no precedence among the Apostles; no officers had been appointed, not even elders; yet the Spirit of God names the assembly of believers at Jerusalem THE CHURCH. Now, the most unflinching, reckless advocate of diocesan episcopacy will hardly assert that at this time this church had a diocesan bishop. It had the twelve Apostles to take care of it, but no bishop. Was it a church, or was it not? Who was the bishop of that diocese? Where, how, and by whom was he ordained? The idle dream that James may have been a diocesan bishop, is so perfectly gratuitous, and without all proof, that it deserves not to be noticed. I might

as appropriately dream that Barnabas or Silas, "chief men among the brethren" was my lord bishop of Jerusalem, as Peter, James, or John. If this system is to be enforced upon the churches, at the peril of their excommunication, you must tell us where, when, and how it arose, you must give us texts of Scripture for it, and show us diocesan bishops in the earliest constitution of the Christian churches. Otherwise, when we find the Holy Spirit declaring that to be a church over which it is demonstrable and indisputable that there was no such governor as a diocesan bishop, we must take the Holy Spirit for our guide, and the Bible for our authority, and no episcopal assumptions or traditions.

Take this same church at a later period, Acts xv. 4. "And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of THE CHURCH, and of the Apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them." In this advanced period we find, besides Apostles, *elders* in this church, but still, no bishop, nor in any intermediate portion of the history any intimation of the creation of such an office, or the appointment of such an officer. If any such were constituted, show us the text, point us to the explicit record, for such, inasmuch as you make it a matter of life or death, you must do. Evolve your proof. Alas, it will not come; the church, and the Apostles, and elders, are all the shape you can possibly make it assume. Was this a church, or was it not? It had no bishop. Yet the Holy Spirit calls it a church. Whom shall we be-

lieve, the Spirit of God, or the traditions and assumptions of diocesan episcopacy?

THE CHURCH AT CESAREA.

Take next, if you please, the church at Cesarea. Compare the passages in which either that church is named, or any hints are given how it might have come into being. Acts viii. 40, Philip stopping at Cesarea in his course of preaching; Acts xviii. 22, Paul, landing at Cesarea, and saluting the church; Acts xxi. 8, Philip, the Evangelist, at Cesarea, as at the first. Here, again, is a church without a bishop. You cannot find an intimation of any such officer, of any such office. If you assume or assert that there was, show us the proof; prove it with as much explicitness as your own unchurching dogma expresses, or you are convicted as arrogant impostors. Here is a church without a bishop, called of God a church. Was it a church, or was it not?

Take the church at Cenchrea; Rom. xvi. 1. Take the churches of Syria and Cilicia; Acts xv. 41. Paul visiting them and confirming their faith. They had no bishop. Were they churches, or were they not? The Holy Spirit calleth them churches. Take the churches of Galatia; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, Paul's notice of them. They had no bishop. Yet the Word of God calls them churches. Were they churches, or were they not?

THE CHURCH AT CORINTH.

Take the church of the Corinthians. Was *that*

also a church, or was it not? Paul regards it as a church, addresses it as such; *yet it had no bishop.* The proof in regard to this particular church is overwhelming; for we have an epistle from Clemens Romanus to the Church at Corinth, in which there is demonstration that their government was, as in the Church at Ephesus, by bishops or elders, and that *they had no diocesan bishop.* The matter is so evident, that episcopal historians themselves argue that it is plain that the episcopal government was not established at Corinth. Now, was this a church, or was it not? Paul's own superscription to his Epistle is this, *Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth.* It is acknowledged that this was a church without a bishop. Yet the insolent dogma, No bishop, no church, gives the lie to the declaration of the Holy Ghost in regard to it. Shall we believe our inspired Apostle, or the traditions, assumptions, and unchurching dogmas of episcopacy.

THE CHURCH AT EPHESUS.

Just so, take the church at Ephesus, Acts xx. 17, and read Paul's final farewell exhortation to the elders of that church. That it was a church without a bishop is as clear from Paul's speech, as that it was a church with elders, as that it was a church at all. Not an individual is alluded to who had any authority whatever over the church, save its elders, and to them Paul committed THE SUPREME CHARGE. It was a church without a bishop. Was it a church, or was it not? The episcopal assumption saith not. Shall we believe the episcopal assumption, or the declaration of the Holy Ghost?

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH.

Once more, take the church at Antioch, Acts xii. 26. See how it arose, Acts xi. 19, 20, 21. There was, first, the persecution on the death of Stephen, scattering the church which was at Jerusalem, to preach the word. Some of these members of the church, thus scattered abroad preaching, were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who came as far as Antioch, and preached to the Grecians there. The hand of the Lord was with them, and many believed. Then the church at Jerusalem, having heard of this; the church, mark you, and no bishop; sent Barnabas, and he came to Antioch; and then Barnabas went to Tarsus, and found Saul, and brought him to Antioch; and "a whole year they assembled themselves with THE CHURCH." Was it a church, or was it not? You cannot here take refuge in the supposition that either Barnabas or Saul were bishops of this diocese; for the inspired record saith, "There were in the church at Antioch *certain prophets and teachers*, among whom were Barnabas and Saul." They were, then, neither of them bishops, and this church at Antioch was a church without a bishop. What becomes of the episcopal assumption here? Will the dogma, No church without a bishop, stand against this express witness of the Holy Spirit?

At an after visit, Paul and Barnabas, separated by the Holy Ghost for this purpose, ordained elders in every church. Take then the churches, when these two men came, ordaining elders in them. Were they churches, or were they not? So far from having a

diocesan bishop, they, as yet, had not even elders. Were they churches, or were they not? You may, perhaps, answer, that the government had not yet been organized. Aye, that is the very point. The passage shows, to demonstration, that even without such organization they were churches of Christ. If I were to hand you a basket of apples, and tell you to cut these apples into exact halves, and then put an artificial stem into each of the halves, and some one should tell you that they were not apples till they were thus halved and stemmed, what should you think of such an argument? The churches were churches before Barnabas and Saul visited them, *just as much as they were afterwards.* Yet, neither before nor after, had they any diocesan bishop. If they had had a bishop, it would have been a curious affair for Paul and Barnabas to take no more notice of him than if he had been a wooden bench in the synagogue. Methinks, if Bishop McIlvaine and Bishop Chase should come into the diocese of New York, and proceed to ordaining elders in every church, they would be very likely to hear from Bishop Onderdonk. And so, if Bishop Barnabas and Bishop Paul came into the diocese of Bishop Diotrephes in Antioch, and without so much as a notice of his existence, proceeded to the work of appointing elders in the churches, they would very likely have heard from Bishop Diotrephes, and we should have heard from him also. There were prophets, teachers, and elders in Antioch, but no diocesan bishops; just as the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch, but not churchmen.

I press this point in reference to the church in Antioch. Before Barnabas and Saul appointed elders, was

that a church, or was it not? If it was, it was a church without a bishop, for not even elders had been appointed, and a prelatical bishop was a creation of ecclesiastical ambition not yet dreamed of. If it was not, did it become a church on the appointment of elders? Then also it was a church without a bishop, for neither of these elders was ordained bishop, and neither Barnabas nor Saul had any diocese in those parts, but were simple messengers from the church in Jerusalem.

Here then we set the issue. It is declared in the Word of God, that Barnabas and Saul appointed elders in every church. It is not said, appointed elders to *make* or *gather* a church, but, appointed elders *in* every church; appointed elders in what already *was* a church. The Holy Ghost then recognizes a church without a bishop, and before the appointment of elders. Let, then, any candid Episcopalian answer the question, Was this a church, or was it not? If you say it was not, you deny the record that God has given, and charge falsehood on the scriptures. Moreover, if it was not, then, of course, on your own theory it had no bishop. If you say it was, then you convict your own assumption, your own dogma, of falsehood. Or again, if you say it was not, but became a church on the appointment of elders, you again convict your own theory of falsehood, acknowledging a church to be a church without a bishop. The dilemma is inextricable, the case is an entire demonstration.

After this case Barnabas and Saul were sent by the Brethren on a great question to Jerusalem. And when they were come, they were received of the Church and of the Apostles, and Elders. Was it a church by itself,

or was it not ? If all the Apostles and elders had died at once, it would still have remained a church. "It pleased the Apostles and elders, with the whole church." Where was the bishop ? Who was he ? What was his office ? Apostles, prophets, teachers, pastors, evangelists, elders, are mentioned as existing and officiating in their respective places in the government of the apostolic church, but never such a creature as a diocesan bishop. You can find no trace of him whatever in the New Testament, nor for more than two hundred years can you find any trace of him at all in the history of Christianity. On the hypothesis that there were diocesan bishops in the New Testament churches, it is a prodigious problem for the advocates of episcopacy to solve, why for the two first centuries of the Christian church the office and the officer should be entirely discontinued. The dogma, no church without a bishop, would unchurch all the churches of the first two hundred years, as well as the non-episcopal churches of the last three hundred.

PRELATICAL MODE OF CREATING AN APOSTLE.

One of the most amusing specimens of the materials, out of which the fabric of Episcopacy is constructed by its advocates, is to be found in their consecration of Epaphroditus as an apostle ! They do this, in order to strain out of the Epistle to the Philippians their three orders in the ministry. Most unfortunately St. Paul superscribes that epistle, To all the saints at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons, but says not a word of any apostle, or diocesan bishop. To get over

this difficulty, they say, that Paul states in the course of the Epistle that Epaphroditus was the Apostle of that church; thus, in chap. ii. 25, "Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus my brother and companion in labor, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants." To make out the Apostle here, it is necessary first to change the translation of the word messenger, and make it *your Apostle*. Our English translators, not having the fear of a church without a bishop before their eyes, and having a good common sense in their understanding, have given it the right meaning, *messenger*, the only meaning, which, in connection with the context, it will bear. For, by turning to chap. iv. 18, you read thus: "But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things *which were sent from you*, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." Epaphroditus, it is clear, was a messenger from the church of the Philippians to Paul, to carry to him the fruits of their benevolence; and this verse explains perfectly the sense in which the word messenger must be taken in the former verse, and makes that sense, and none other, necessary. But the advocates of diocesan episcopacy have seized this benevolent errand of Epaphroditus, and exalted him by means of it into the apostleship! They have smelled in Epaphroditus' errand the sweet smell of a diocesan bishop, the fragrance of an apostolical diploma.

But who ever heard of the Apostle of a particular church, or where now is the successor of such an officer? According to this train of argument the agents and treasurers of our modern benevolent societies

are apostles. And if because the word *αποστολος* is here used, you therefore make Epaphroditus an apostle like Paul, then, because the word *διακονος* is used with regard to our Saviour, it makes him, by the same argument, nothing but a deacon. It is impossible fully to characterize the weakness and puerility of such pretended arguments. Arguments they are not, and they have not ingenuity enough to be dignified with the name of sophistry, which generally possesses some shadow of consistency and plausibility.

It ought to be added that we have also an epistle from Polycarp (living next after the Apostles) to the same church at Philippi, in which, just as in Paul's Epistle, Polycarp speaks of two officers only, the presbyters and deacons, and gives not the most distant allusion to such a creature as a diocesan bishop, not the slightest hint of the existence of any other officer than presbyters and deacons. The idea of Bishop Epaphroditus seems not to have crossed Polycarp's mind; and as the church at Philippi do not seem to have been sending any messenger with gifts to him, as they had been to Paul, there is no one in his epistle, whom the apostolical successionists can conveniently *Apostolicise;* an omission perfectly unaccountable on their theory. And this church at Philippi is the only one in which they even attempt to show their three orders, doing it in this instance, by the help of Epaphroditus, changing the benevolent scrip, which he bore to Paul, into an apostolical diploma for himself; the odor of his benevolence, into the insignia of his own apostleship.

Let us suppose that Epaphroditus himself had done this; that on the ground of his having this errand to

Paul from the church of the Philippians, and having this letter of their benevolence superscribed "*by our messenger, αποστολος, Epaphroditus,*" he had claimed for himself, as is now in some quarters, on the same ground, claimed for him, the rank and authority of an apostle. What would have been his reception by Paul? "Why," says Epaphroditus, "I am an apostle!" "You an apostle?" says Paul, "I never heard of it before. When did you become one? Who sealed you for this office? Who gave you this commission? Where are the signs of your apostleship? Where are your miracles and proofs of authority?" "Why," says Epaphroditus, "in this letter from the Philippians. Am I not called their *αποστολος*? And have I not brought to you from them a large supply of money and garments? And is not this the work of an apostle? The seal of mine apostleship is this errand in the Lord; and let me tell you, Master Paul, every good advocate of the Episcopacy will receive it as such; and though you may now reject my claims, yet the time will come, when, on account of this very errand, my name shall be placed with yours, amidst the dignitaries of episcopal authority, in the roll of the Apostles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The absurdity of some things is better developed by ridicule than in any other way. I may, therefore, be pardoned the introduction of this dialogue into a grave argument; for it is what might very likely have taken place, had Epaphroditus been so vain a fool as to argue for himself in the way the prelatical succession-ists have argued for him.

ASSUMPTION OF THE APOSTLESHIP OF BARNABAS TESTED BY THE WORD OF GOD.

The same career of assumption and supposition in place of proof sets down also the name of Barnabas among the Apostles, the object being to gain some ground of authority for the hypothesis that the apostolic dignity was continued by succession, and has passed, in a way of which the successionists do not condescend to inform us, into the lordship of the order of diocesan bishops. The men who reason thus must have been totally unaccustomed to any such searching and comparison of scripture, as would, in the way of the admirable argument in the Horæ Paulinæ, enable them to detect their own errors. Let us test this assertion of Barnabas being an apostle in this way. You have only to compare Acts ix. 26, 27, with Galatians i. 18, 19, and you will find explicit proof amounting, in fact, to an express declaration of Paul, that Barnabas was *not* an apostle. The two passages refer, as will be seen, to the same visit of Paul to Jerusalem from Damascus. In the one of these passages Paul declares that in that visit he saw none of the Apostles save Peter and James. From the other passage it is manifest that he did see Barnabas, who was then "of note among the Apostles," and who, indeed, himself introduced Paul to those apostles whom he did see. Consequently the case is clear that Barnabas was not an apostle. Let us put the two passages in juxta-position. The first reads thus: "And when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he essayed to join him-

self to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus." The second passage reads thus (Gal. i. 18, 19.), "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother." Fourteen years after, Paul went up to Jerusalem again with Barnabas, and at this time, and on some other occasions, Barnabas was entrusted with errands, which made him a *messenger* of the churches, much in the same way as Epaphroditus was for the church of the Philippians. But if errands of responsibility and trust constituted apostles, then were Judas and Silas, and many others, "our brethren, the messengers of the churches" (2 Cor. viii. 8, 23), apostles also.

SECTARIAN PREJUDICE MUST BE LAID ASIDE IN ORDER TO APPEAL TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In an appeal to the New Testament, no man can be firm and fearless, who does not divest himself of sectarian prejudices, before he enters that sacred enclosure. If he comes there expecting to find his own *ism*, you need not look to him for frankness and freedom of investigation. He will torture some passages, he will force others, he will add to others, he will take nothing in its plain and simple meaning. And if the

plain and simple meaning be against him, he will keep away as much as possible from the open field of truth, he will run to the Fathers, he will *imbosk*, as Milton says, and you seek in vain to draw him from the wilderness of the Fathers into the simplicity of the scriptures. The adherents of an ecclesiastical system which, like that of episcopacy, came out of Romanism, and not out of the primitive apostolic Christianity, will be especially fond of browsing in those same patristical and traditionary pastures, where Romanism has grown corpulent. The Christianity of the New Testament affords too spare a diet for such a scheme. The Christianity of the New Testament is not one of exclusive *isms;* and hence, the more arrogantly any sect *claims* to be, of divine right, the only true church, the less likely it is to *be* the true church. Hence, while in pursuing the argument through the New Testament you have to confess that, strictly speaking, Congregationalism is not there as a model, inasmuch as it has no elders; nor Independency, because of the same omission; nor Presbyterianism, because its elders are not bishops; least of all is Episcopalianism to be found there, inasmuch as it has three or more orders in the ministry, while the New Testament churches have only one; and its government excludes elders, while in the New Testament churches these invariably were the overseers of the flock. And yet, while the system of Episcopalianism is the widest in its departure from the New Testament model, it is the most sectarian, the most exclusive, the most bigoted of all modern denominations.

It is the only one of all modern denominations,

that refuses to admit other ministers of Christ into its pulpits; and until some man shall be found in its ranks of sufficient firmness to resist this exclusiveness, the reproach of priority in bigotry must rest upon it. If Dr. Stone or Dr. Milnor should rise superior to this spirit, and in proof of it should say to Dr. Spring or Dr. Skinner, I invite you, as a brother minister of Christ, to a ministerial exchange of our mutual pulpit services on the Sabbath, that would be a happy example of a truly catholic and not bigoted spirit; it would be the only successful positive denial of the charge of bigotry and exclusiveness; and it would do more to convince the world that their profession of the gospel is not formalism, but spirit and power, than all other measures that could be taken. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

EPISCOPAL EXCLUSIVENESS PASSING INTO HOSTILITY AGAINST MISSIONS WITHOUT EPISCOPACY.

But at present, what is the exhibition made to the world? Why, that the form is of more importance than the spirit; and not content with making this impression in Christian lands, it is carried even among the heathen, even into missionary operations, introducing there a disgraceful, undermining rivalry and hostility against those simple-hearted missionaries of the Cross, whose object and business is simply to preach the gospel, and not "episcopacy, confirmation, and a liturgy."

The same spirit of bigotry which here asserts that there can be no church without a bishop, denounces, in heathen lands, those who have gone to carry the glad tidings of the gospel without the episcopal *form*, as schismatical, unauthorized intruders into the ministry, as men who have no right to preach, nor to administer the ordinances of the gospel. This is melancholy to the last degree. An episcopal clergyman in Constantinople said to a young pious Armenian, who had been converted by the grace of Christ through the instrumentality of the missionaries of the American Board, "Those men (the American missionaries) may be good men, but they are no priests. I am a priest. But they are no priests, no ministers of Christ." And this injurious, undermining mode of missionary operations is just the legitimate result of the unchurching dogma, which in this country has been proclaimed as the foundation of the Episcopal Church.

Now, God forbid that we should charge this spirit upon all Episcopalians. We know that there are those who mourn over it. There is also a distinction between the laity and the clergy in this matter; and there is a portion of the clergy, who privately abandon the assumptions of the apostolical succession. But when will they publicly and practically disavow and resist them? Until they do this, they are partakers of the sinfulness of this exclusive unchurching spirit, so contrary to the spirit of our Blessed Saviour. Until they do this, they uphold a system, which tends to the destruction of our religious liberty.

PAPISTICAL NATURE OF THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

Episcopalianism becomes Popery in essence, when it takes to its bosom the Apostolical Succession. Its priests assert that everything is in their hands, that baptism is regeneration, that there is no regeneration without it, and that there is no baptism except *through* a prelatical bishop. If you enter the prison of such a system, it will make you do as it pleases. Its monopoly cannot be broken. You dare not go elsewhere, for salvation is only within its walls. Let its rules be ever so rigid, you are obliged to abide by them; it may tax you to its heart's content, but if there is no salvation out of its ordinances, what are you to do? It may take away all your liberties, but if it holds the key of your salvation, you are a helpless victim, and cannot stir. Once give to the system of Episcopalianism the claims which the apostolical successionists are advancing, and you have a perfect Spiritual Despotism, quite as remorseless as Popery itself.

Whether these odious pretensions are rightly attributed to Episcopalians as a body in this country, we do not undertake to decide; but they *are* the pretensions of those who love the pre-eminence, and who possess it, to a degree, in their conventions, and in their Metropolitan royalties. And those who do not side with these dignitaries, will nevertheless have to bear the reproach of such pretensions, unless they plainly disavow and resist them, and are willing to make some effort to reform their church of them. Whatever persons in the church do not, so far as they may be able, oppose these injurious maxims and prac-

tices, they are themselves partakers in the ungodliness of that zeal which was marked of the Apostle John in the case of "Diotrephes, who loveth the pre-eminence, and casteth us out of the Church;" and as such, Christ will hold them responsible; responsible for holding with a system, which denounces and insults the members of Christ's own body, responsible for sanctioning the course of those who say to the foot, Because thou art not the hand, therefore thou art not of the body; the course of those, who thus are themselves true schismatics, and are guilty of offending thousands of "little ones who believe in Christ."

The prophecy of Christ in regard to individuals causing offences, that it were better if a millstone were fastened to the neck of a man "who shall offend one of these little ones who believe in me," and he were cast into the sea, has been fulfilled in regard to those *systems*, which in like manner offend and persecute those believers in Christ, who choose not their forms. For, with this ambitious, persecuting zeal there have been connected two monstrous errors, namely, that baptism is regeneration, and that communion at the Lord's Supper is Christianity and Salvation; errors, which will be found at the Day of Judgment to have consigned thousands upon thousands, in that Church, in the security of unpardoned sin, over to its eternal consequences. A man may say, I had rather a thousand times be a dissenter in England, and endure all the chains and persecutions, which might be laid upon me, than take my seat at the Lord's table in the Establishment, as thousands are doing, with honors heaped upon me, and the millstone about my soul of a baptismal re-

generation, or a Eucharistical salvation. The Establishment of England, in enshrining such errors, is all the while providing for herself the penal retributions of God, for having cast out and trampled under foot, not only dissenting individuals, but whole denominations of Christians. For, what retribution can be more dreadful, what millstone heavier, what wrath worse to bear, than that of being discovered to have thrown the weight of her own worldliness, magnificence, and zeal, to crush her own members, in sacramental Pharisaism, down to hell!

DANGER TO OUR RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES FROM SUCH EXCLUSIVENESS.

And if there were an Episcopalian Establishment in this country, is it not plain, from every indication, that it would follow the same course? It would be a persecuting Establishment, most dangerous to the liberties of our country. Even Bishop Hopkins, already, has advised an ecclesiastical censorship; and Bishop Onderdonk has issued his circular, declaring that on the subject of supposed delinquencies in the higher clergy, men must for ever hold their peace, unless they are willing to undergo the delay, the vexation, the expense, of a regular ecclesiastical impeachment and trial, the canons of the Church forbidding a man to say one word of critical opinion even, unfavorable to the line of conduct which the ruling dignitaries may think proper to assume. If such an ecclesiastical establishment should gain the power, then let men see to it, that they stand from before the mouth of such cannon.

They will sweep the freedom of opinion like the artillery of an Austrian despotism.

There is a tendency, in some minds among us, to admire the august display of consolidated unity, pomp, and order, in a combined monarchical and ecclesiastical Establishment like that of Great Britain. Now we make no affectation of patriotism or democracy; but we hold that loyalty to one's native country is a virtue; and if we had been born Hottentots, we would shield so far as in us lay, our community of huts from reproach; and so far as our judgment permitted, we would assert it to be the best community in existence. This is the filial principle of our nature, towards our *mother-land*. But, born as we are under a government which, when rightly administered, is the best in the world, we hold it as poor policy, as it is want of patriotism, to be hankering after the flesh-pots of Egypt, and praising the allied influences of a monarchical and ecclesiastical Establishment.

In paying, in a former lecture, our tribute of admiration to the defenders of religious liberty, in persecuting ages of the world, we ought not to have passed by without special mention of gratitude and love, the great and noble name of Roger Williams, of Rhode Island. Read, in Bancroft's History of the United States, the story of that remarkable man's adventures in the patient pursuit of an asylum of perfect religious liberty, and you will be constrained to acknowledge that he deserves to stand high in the gratitude of his countrymen. You will be ready to admit the justice of Governor Hopkins' declaration, that "Roger Williams justly claims the honor of having been the first legisla-

tor in the world, in its later ages, who fully and effectually provided for and established a full, free, and absolute liberty of conscience." It was upon such men's minds, as upon the world's mountain summits, that the light of that rising sun of liberty first fell, which was to fill the vales with its unclouded purity. And is it not most remarkable, that out of the fires of persecution God should have gathered so many men of this character, men taught the preciousness of religious liberty by their own experience of the bitter arrogance and cruelty of prelatical and unchurching tyranny, to colonize this country, and to build up in it the temple of universal freedom. Is it not most remarkable, that the seed-corn of the population of this country should have been gathered out of the persecuted religionists of so many other countries? To the admirable Huguenots of France we owe as noble a line of descendants, in the stream of our native patriots, as to their brother puritans of England. Our institutions of civil and religious liberty have also received no little portion of their breath of life from the free and hospitable Dutch, who gave our Puritan fathers an asylum from prelatical persecution, and then fled with or followed them into the American wilderness, to build up there the foundations of many generations. We owe almost all our civil and religious liberty, and the support of it through the American Revolution, to the indomitable spirit of men cast out and persecuted by the Established Episcopal Church of England; while, to the supporters, defendants, and descendants of that church, *in its exclusiveness*, we owe almost nothing, but the revival, in this very day, of an unchurching, intolerant

proscription. One of the causes, indeed, of our Revolution itself, was an attempt to set up and enforce an Episcopal Establishment.

The church, from which this proscription comes, is, in its allowance, laying again the foundation of that religious persecution, from which, please God, his own rich grace, and the constitution of government with which he has blessed us, shall ever keep our churches free. But if this proscription in theory is adhered to and defended, it will be no thanks to the Episcopal church in this country that the prisons are not here also opened to nonconformists, and that the stake itself is not erected, with fagots piled around it, and men called dissenters chained within its fires. Already, in the list of their dioceses, the Episcopal bishops range the whole population of every State in the Union as belonging to THE CHURCH.

AMUSING FORM OF THE UNCHURCHING EDICT.

The edict, which went forth lately, in the course of this controversy, deliberately unchurching all the churches of Christ that have sprung up for the last three hundred years, was a most singular exhibition of church pride and intolerance. The Quixotic chivalry and absurdity of such a bull of excommunication is more than ever manifest, when you remember that it comes out of a church, which itself was not regarded as a church, even by the Episcopal sect in England, until within a few years; and that the English church itself is one of those communities that, in her schismatic

separation from the church of Rome, has sprung up within three centuries. We have then the curious spectacle, in this country, of a portion of one of the smallest religious sects in it, legitimatized only within a few years by its foreign parent, that parent being herself a schismatic church three hundred years ago, standing forth before the religious world, and declaring that every church of Christ, besides that one little sect, is no church, but a mushroom schismatical community! Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Dutch Reformed, German Reformed, Independents, every possible denomination of Christians *out of the Episcopal sect*, are denied the name, essence, and rights of churches of Christ; and to cover and excuse this exclusion, are branded with the reproach of being *wilfully and knowingly schismatics*, unlawfully baptized; and if, by any possibility, Christians, yet such only in individual loneliness, and without the sure salvation of the magic of apostolical succession, prelatical consecration, baptismal regeneration, and Episcopal confirmation. If this be not a ludicrous development of the exhilarating gas in the balloon of hierarchical arrogance, we know not what is. But to crown all, the magnanimous offer is made, if all the churches of the said unhappy flocks of Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and others, should at any time take fire, and burn to the ground, then the said Episcopal sect will, out of compassion to those under God's uncovenanted mercies, open her charitable doors, and even give them that bread and wine, which neither they nor their fathers, for 300 years, ever received lawfully, and which now,

for the first time, being of apostolical succession, can administer nourishment and life to their souls!

Now, in all probability, what would become of our civil and religious liberties, if a party holding such pretensions as these could get the power? We speak in regard to these pretensions the more unhesitatingly and the more severely, because Episcopal bishops of a large and noble spirit, superior to these lunacies of bigotry, have themselves marked these pretensions for the same scorn. And whatever a portion of the Episcopal clergy in this country may do, the laity will not cease to reject and repudiate those pretensions. They constitute the groundwork of religious persecution, the inoculating *virus* of the plague, the seeds of a harvest of intolerance, if, in a cold climate like ours, a hot-bed of power can be prepared for them.

The principle of intolerance comes from the pride of our nature. A man may really be too pious to indulge pride personally, but put it in the form of a sect, pride of sect, and it begins to wear the appearance of a virtue. Thus this pious man communes with it; then, in the exaltation of his sect, this master sin of the fallen soul speaks out in bitterness and cruelty to those that differ, that will not conform to that one sect; and though a man may be a Christian brother, it spurns him as if he were a dog; it no more regards his feelings than if he were made of wood; it denies his children Christian burial; it will martyr him for a cap or a surplice.

CANONS OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT.

I have asked what would become of our religious

liberties, if such men should get the power. I will answer the question by referring you to the church canons prepared by and under that incarnation of hierarchical bigotry, Archbishop Bancroft. The severe sufferings endured by the Puritans under these canons, although unlawfully inflicted, are only the inevitable result of such anathemas in every age, when the ecclesiastic curse is sustained by power. The first canon declares that "whosoever shall affirm that the Church of England by law established is not a true and apostolical church, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked error."

Canon IV. Whosoever shall affirm that the form of God's worship in the Church of England established by law and contained in the book of common prayer and administration of sacraments is a corrupt, superstitious and unlawful worship, *or contains anything repugnant to scripture*, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Canon V. Whosoever shall affirm that any of the thirty-nine articles of the church, agreed upon in the year 1562 *for avoiding diversity of opinions*, and for establishing consent touching true religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe to, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Canon VI. Whosoever shall affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by the law established are wicked, antichristian, superstitious, or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, good men may not with a good conscience approve, or as

occasion requires, subscribe, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Canon VII. Whosoever shall affirm that the government of the Church of England by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is anti-christian or repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Canon VIII. Whosoever shall affirm that the form and manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, or deacons, contains anything repugnant to the Word of God, or that persons so made and consecrated are not lawfully made, or need any other calling or ordination to their divine offices, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Canon IX. Whosoever shall separate from the communion of the Church of England, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules, and combine together in a new brotherhood, accounting those who conform to the doctrines, rites and ceremonies of the church, unmeet for their communion, let them be excommunicated, &c.

Canon X. Whosoever shall affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England, and their adherents, may take to themselves truly the name of another church not established by law, and shall publish that their pretended church has groaned under the burden of certain grievances imposed on them by the Church of England, let them be excommunicated, &c.

Canon XI. Whosoever shall affirm that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the king's born subjects, than such as are established by law, which may rightly challenge to

themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Mark this last canon. *No bishop, no church;* no church out of the established church; no church out of the Episcopal church; any person who shall dare assert the contrary, shall be excommunicated.

You see here the iron hand of despotism laid upon all diversity of opinions, that is, upon all liberty of thought in that province, in which, of all others, the soul ought to be most free, the province of religion. But what is most remarkable, you see here the very same odious assertion, only carried a little further out, which has been put forth and reiterated among us, namely, that the Episcopal Church is the only church, and that all other churches are pretended churches, and all other ministers pretended ministers, and to be excommunicated. Let any man read over the Eleventh Canon cited above, and compare it with the recent fulmination in the newspapers, that none of the communities which have sprung up for the last three hundred years out of the Episcopal Church, calling themselves churches, are to be considered as churches, and let him remember the greater light and liberty under which we live, than that which Bancroft enjoyed, and he will at once give the palm of illiberality and bigotry to the modern fulmination; he will say that a spirit which in the United States in this century could entertain a theory of such wholesale exclusiveness, would, in the sixteenth century, have gone farther than Bancroft or Laud himself in the practice of wholesale persecution, and would now be likely, if opportunity offered, again to reduce such theory to such practice

The theory of these arrogant religionists, the professed disciples of Christ, who deliver over all persons who do not belong to *their* church, to the uncovenanted mercies of God, as out of the Church of Christ, reminds us of the well known blessing, which an extremely orthodox layman used to ask at table; "Lord bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more." This man was High Church in his benedictions. His theology led him always to remark, whenever the subject of human merit was under consideration, that men deserve simply and only to be born, to die, and to go to hell. There was one good thing in such a theology, namely, that it was universal and not partial, no respecter of persons. But to have such a theology for a particular part, whom your fulminations consign to hell, is indeed monstrous.

Now the theology of Rome says of all dissenters that they are heretics, and deserve simply and only to perish everlastingly. They do not deserve to be born, and if Rome could do it, every heretical child would be smothered in infancy. This, too, is the voice of a portion of the Episcopal church, that every person who does not belong to that church, is a schismatic, and accursed. The Romish Church fulminates her thunders loud and clear, Every heretic accursed! The Established Episcopal Church, which is one of the many religious sects in England, imitates the same thunders, Every dissenter to the uncovenanted mercies of God! The Episcopal Church, which is an incomparably smaller religious sect in this country, imitates the same thunders, but more feebly. There is no church but our church, nor any regular salvation out of it! Each of

these sects in turn says of the Pope's bulls, "That's my thunder!" Even in this country, where every Church, Romish, Episcopal, Baptist, Methodist, Congregational, Presbyterian, All, owe their religious liberty, even their liberty to scold at others, to an independent, persecuted, Puritan Church in the wilderness, the word *dissent* has been bandied about, and a faint and feeble imitation of the Established Church of England, in her application of the term *dissenters*, has been attempted! Could anything be more ridiculous? Well do the supporters of such assumptions in a free land like this, deserve to be called the Chinamen of Christendom.

In the intolerance of Rome there is at least the merit of originality; it is likewise on a large scale; there is a certain savage sublimity about it, everything in the extreme, everything furious; fulminating bulls, racks, tortures, fires. In the intolerance and arrogance of a second-hand Episcopal sect, unacknowledged, a year or two ago, even by the English Church, through which they claim parentage, there is such a pitiful imitativeness and inherent weakness, that it moves our shame to notice it. And yet, being suffered to sleep so long time without notice, it has gained a factitious importance, and having been developed even in the missionary field, it shows a most dangerous and oppressive tendency, which makes it necessary now to expose both its ludicrous folly and its melancholy wickedness. It is but an off-shoot of the system which forms the subject of these lectures, The Hierarchical Despotism.

NECESSITY OF RESISTING THIS DESPOTISM.

The spirit of this despotism it is the duty of every Christian to resist; and that, not merely because such a despotism is subversive of the rights of every individual disciple of Christ, but because the truth and vitality of the gospel cannot stand along with it. Thus Paul speaks of those "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; THAT THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL MIGHT CONTINUE WITH YOU." If the truth of the gospel is to continue, such bondage *must* be resisted; but if the gospel must be given up, if such bondage *must* be endured, there are many who would prefer undisguised Popery to the lordship of diocesan episcopacy. If we are to worship the sign of the beast, let us have him *in puris naturalibus*, and we shall know better how to deal with him.

From the beast *in puris naturalibus*, from the Anti-Christian Church of Rome, as in her blackest corruption the only representative of the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, prelacy traces her descent and authority. "She boasts," says the author of The Primitive Church, "her ordinances, her sacraments, transmitted for a thousand years, unimpaired, uncontaminated, through such hands! High Church Episcopacy proudly draws her own apostolical succession through this pit of pollution, and then the followers of Christ, who care not to receive such grace from such hands, she calmly de-

livers over to God's uncovenanted mercies! Nay more, multitudes of this communion are now engaged in the strange work of 'unprotestantizing the churches' which have washed themselves from these defilements. The strife is, with a proud array of talents, of learning, and of episcopal power, to bury all spiritual religion again in the grave of forms, to shroud the light of truth in the darkness of popish tradition, and to sink the church of God once more into that abyss of deep and dreadful darkness from which she emerged at the dawn of the Reformation. In the beautiful and expressive language of Milton, their strife is to 're-involve us in that pitchy cloud of infernal darkness where we shall never more see the sun of truth again, never hope for the cheerful dawn, never more hear the bird of morning sing.'"

I have spoken already at large on the intimate connection between our religious and civil liberties. One of the objections powerfully urged against episcopacy in the unanswerable work of Mr. Coleman on The Primitive Church, is its monarchical and anti-republican tendency. On the other hand, the system of religion in the New Testament "harmonizes with and fosters our free institutions."

"There is a harmony between government and religion. There is a mutual relation and adaptation between our free, republican government, and a popular ecclesiastical organization, like that of the apostolical and primitive church. Such a system harmonizes with our partialities and prejudices; it coincides with our national usages; it is congenial to all our civil institutions. This is a consideration of great importance. It

is enough of itself to outweigh, a thousand fold, all that prelacy ever dreamed of in its own favor. Indeed, the spiritual despotism of that system, its absolute monarchical powers, constitute one strong objection to it. It is the religion of despots and tyrants. Such the papal form of it has always been; and such, we cannot doubt, is still one inherent characteristic of high, exclusive Episcopacy, however it may be modified by circumstances. The Church of England, from the time of its establishment, says Macaulay, 'continued to be, for more than one hundred and fifty years, the servile handmaid of monarchy, the steady enemy of public liberty.' James, the tyrant of that age, uniformly silenced every plea in behalf of the Puritans, with the significant exclamation, 'No bishop, no king.' So indispensable is the hierarchy to a monarchy. But in a free republic it is a monstrous anomaly."

The exclusive, intolerant spirit of Episcopacy is justly regarded by this writer as one of its most obnoxious characteristics. "That this single church," he says, "should assume to be the only true church, and its clergy the only authorized ministers; that the only valid ordinances and sacraments are administered in their communion; that they alone of all to whom salvation by grace is so freely published, are received into covenant mercy,—all this appears to us as nothing else than a proud and sanctimonious self-righteousness, which we can only regard with unmingled abhorrence. There is an atrocity of character in this spirit, which can unchurch the saints of God of every age, in every Christian communion save one, and consign them, if not to perdition, to God's

uncovenanted mercies;—in all this there is an atrocity of character, which, in other days, has found, as it seems to us, its just expression in the fires of Smithfield, and in the slow torture of the *auto-da-fé*. Episcopacy holds no fellowship, no communion with us,—*dissenters*. 'The Episcopal church, deriving its episcopal power in regular succession from the holy Apostles, through the venerable church of England,' makes public declaration, through its bishops, that it has 'no ecclesiastical connection with the followers of Luther and Calvin.' Be it so. To all this we have no right to object. But we have a right to our own conclusions respecting the exclusiveness of such a religion.

"It is also the same spirit for which high-church episcopacy has ever been so much distinguished,—that is, unmitigated hatred of the religion of the Puritans. 'Laud and his party began, about the end of Elizabeth's reign, by preaching the divine right, as it is called, or absolute indispensability of episcopacy; a doctrine, of which the first traces, as I apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth's reign. They insisted on the necessity of episcopal succession, regularly derived from the Apostles. They drew an inference from this tenet, that ordination by presbyters was, in all cases, null." Of Lutherans and Calvinists, they began now to speak, as aliens, to whom they were not at all related, and schismatics, with whom they held no communion; nay, as wanting the very essence of Christian society."

Precisely this intolerance of the age of Laud is now exhibited in theory, and, so far as there is power and opportunity, carried out in practice, at this very day,

by the Apostolical Successionists in the Episcopal church. On missionary ground it is enacted by instruction and authority, in the name of the whole Episcopal denomination; and as noble a band of missionaries as the world has ever seen since the days of the Apostles—a band of men who had occupied the untrodden missionary field near twenty years before the Episcopal church in this country had a single missionary in the world,—are denounced by the bishop of that church as schismatics, and unauthorized intruders into the work of the ministry.

CONCLUSION.

It is painful to be compelled to say these things. Infinitely rather, if episcopalian exclusiveness permitted it, would we be found praising the missionary zeal of the sect that unchurches all other sects in Christendom; infinitely rather would we unite with them, as mutual Christians ought to do, in spreading the gospel of our Lord and Saviour. Thank God, a time is coming, when this bitter, poisonous leaven of spiritual pride and despotism shall be overcome by love; when this arrogant assumption of being the only true church shall he chased out of the world, to the place that it belongs to. It is the very spirit of him who said,

> Better to reign in hell, than serve in Heaven!

And except this pride give way to charity, then, even in heathen lands, will Christian sects build up an arena to fight out the stormy conflicts that disgrace their Christianity at home. And as in the very presence of

the Saviour, but a few hours before his death, there was a strife among his disciples who should be the greatest, so now, in the most sacred place of his service on earth, amidst perishing unbelievers in the darkness of idolatry, will this unchurching spirit fight, as a frightful spectacle to angels and to men, against those who choose not to range themselves under the banners of "episcopacy, confirmation, and a liturgy!" There can be no peace or charity, along with the "curst ungodliness" of such zeal; and we may rest assured that except God cast out this devil of intolerance from our system, we are not the people whom he can use to spread the gospel of Christ through the world. In the name of a world lying in wickedness, and demanding all our united efforts to save it; in the name of Him, who, though he was Lord of all, became the servant of all, that he might bring us as freemen to God; in the name of that humility and gentleness, of which he set us all such an example, when he, our Lord and Master, washed his disciples' feet; let us, in ourselves and in others, put this wicked intolerance away from us with sorrow and shame; let us crucify that spirit, which so crucifies the Saviour. "For now abideth FAITH, HOPE, CHARITY, these three; but the greatest of these is CHARITY."

ΘΕΩ ΜΟΝΩ ΔΟΞΑ!

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

THE ARGUMENT

OF

REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER,

IN REPLY TO

J. L. O'SULLIVAN, ESQ.,

IN THE

BROADWAY TABERNACLE,

ON THE EVENINGS OF JANUARY 27th, AND FEBRUARY 3d & 17th.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY SAXTON & MILES,

205 Broadway.

BOSTON—SAXTON & PEIRCE.

1843.

S. W. BENEDICT & CO., PRINT.

PREFACE.

THE debate by which the following argument was called forth, was originally intended for only two evenings. Meantime, there occurred a debate on the same subject before the New York Lyceum, in which the Rev. Dr. Cox, and Horace Greeley, Esq. were among the speakers. There occured also a second evening's debate between these two gentlemen, each occupying one hour. After this came the second evening of the debate between Mr. O'Sullivan and the author of the present argument. At the close of that evening Mr. O'Sullivan unexpectedly challenged his opponent to continue the discussion one evening longer, and this invitation being accepted, the whole debate was thus protracted through five evenings in five weeks. The following argument embraces the debate of three of those evenings, on the side against the abolition of capital punishment. The question as stated was as follows:

"*Resolved*, THAT CAPITAL PUNISHMENT OUGHT TO BE ABOLISHED."

The Report of the argument appeared originally, with some omissions, in the New York Evangelist. In the present volume one or two paragraphs are added, which the author was compelled to omit in the discussion for want of time. Some critical remarks on the statute in Genesis, have been also given at the close of the third evening's argument, in addition to the preceding examination of it.

INTRODUCTION.

THERE were points in this argument important to dwell upon, which were passed over, partly for want of time, and partly because they had been noted in a former treatise on Capital Punishment, which treatise is before the public. Of this nature was that probable reason for the promulgation of this ordinance to Noah, which looks back into the state of society in the antediluvian world. I have argued that in consequence of the divine lenity in the case of Cain the crime of murder had become frightfully common, the earth being filled with violence. The assurance that his own life would not be taken, with which Lamech, whether a murderer or a homicide, comforted himself and his wives by the example of Cain's preservation, shows how men reasoned from that lenity; and that the consequence of it would be a great cheapness in the estimate of human life, a great freedom in the indulgence of violent passion unrestrained by consequences, and a perfect carelessness and recklessness in blood-shed.

Now in this ordinance the Divine Legislator made a covenant with Noah and his posterity to preserve

them, by this ordinance, from that frightful state of society, which had prevailed in the antediluvian world without this ordinance. This consideration is not absolutely necessary as an introduction to the right understanding of the law, or of the reasons why it was given forth now first at the commencement of the repeopling of the world by Noah. Its intrinsic reasonableness carries an appeal to the human mind; and moreover, Jehovah has condescended to annex to it the highest possible reason that could be supposed or given; neither can our ignorance of the reason why an ordinance based upon such perpetual grounds was not promulgated at a previous period weaken the nature of such grounds in our estimation, or diminish our sense of the intrinsic reasonableness of such an ordinance. If it did, we might also say that the late promulgation of the Christian Religion to the Gentile world was a proof that it is not of universal necessity, nor of scriptural excellence, for that, if it had been, it would assuredly have been promulgated to all the world much earlier, which reasoning would be a most presumptuous and daring arraignment of the wisdom and goodness of God.

We do not therefore need the antediluvian argument to strengthen our conviction of the wisdom of this statute or to protect its reason from cavil. Still, the examination of the state of affairs in the antediluvian world adds great power to our argument in the inter-

pretation of this statute, which indeed on no principles of common sense, any more than by right principles of criticism, can be interpreted in any other way than as an injunction.

Another point of importance noted in the previous volume on this subject regards the state of society on the earth at the period when, in point of fact, the statute enacting death as the penalty for murder was first promulgated. Inconsequent, inaccurate, and forgetful reasoners are deluded by a set of declaimers about the savage and barbarous state of society which made this law expedient then, though in a change of circumstances it might not be expedient now. There is a deplorable disregard of truth in this declamation, as well as a surprising degree of ignorance, which marks much of the argument advanced against this statute. In point of fact the state of society which first called for the promulgation of this law was characterised by a degree of refinement, knowledge and piety far greater than now prevails in any community where men are calling for the abolition of this law. Nevertheless, what senseless references men are often found making to a supposed barbarous state of the world, which may have made this statute necessary, though a more refined state of existence would render it unnecessary. Not only was it first given forth while there was a greater proportion both of piety and wisdom in the world than there has ever been since, but it was re-en-

acted many centuries afterwards, still more explicitly, for the wisest, most refined and religous community in the world's history.

It is sometimes said that in that early period there were no prisons, and therefore it was necessary to kill the murderer, because they could not keep him. What then could they do with the thief, the robber, the house-breaker? By the same reasoning they must kill him, because they had no prisons in which to keep him. I think if they could build cities, they could also build prisons. The state of society in which the Tower of Babel could be erected, was not likely to suffer for want of a jail.

If this had been the reason for this statute, certainly it would have been stated. The statute would have run thus: Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, because at present there are no prisons to confine him in. And it would have been added: As soon as you are strong enough to build a jail, or to hew and transport stones of a sufficient size for a murderer's prison, then this statute must be laid aside, there being no longer any use or necessity for it. If this had been the reason for this statute, how happens it that at an after period, when there was no more deficiency in prisons than in thieves and murderers, there being abundance of both, this very same statute is re-promulgated, with the additional command that in no case whatever shall the penalty of death to the murderer be commuted, but

that in every case, without fail, the murderer shall be put to death? Was this because they had no prisons?

In truth, in the case of every argument brought against this statute, and every expedient by which men would evade it, we need only turn to the reason given for it by Jehovah, and in a moment, in spite of all sophistry, its meaning is as clear as the day, its obligation is seen to be perpetual.

Another point, which could not be dwelt upon in the course of the debate, is the idea of Right and of Moral Necessity, as well as of utility and expediency, applied to punishment as the ground of it. Such absurd consequences follow from the assertion that utility is the only ground of punishment, that no close reasoner can maintain this assertion for a moment. If it be so, and you punish merely because punishment is useful, then the punishment of an innocent man may in certain circumstances be just as useful as that of a guilty man; and if in any circumstances it be more useful, you are bound then to punish not the guilty, but the innocent. The words desert, justice, punishment, convey ideas over and above the idea of utility. We do not punish because it is useful, but because it is deserved and just; and being deserved and just, it cannot but be useful. There can be no doubt that punishment, even in this world, is sometimes called for, apart from the question whether it be useful or not. Indeed, there is sometimes a demand in the bosom of the guilty

person himself, for punishment, and a sort of satisfaction beneath the punishment, as if a necessary law of the human mind, apart from all considerations of utility, were complied with. No doubt such a law exists, in regard to retribution for sin; and though there can be no conceivable case in which such retribution is not useful, still, the human mind, in its judgment of the matter, does not base the necessity of retribution upon its usefulness, but upon its justice. Its intrinsic *justice* is the ground of its *utility;* its *utility* is not the ground of its *justice.*

This opens up a whole world of truth, most solemn and important, in the connections of this subject with the divine government, and the nature of retribution and penalty in eternity. Of course, it was impossible to follow out the argument in this direction, in our limited debate. But the examination of this subject, in the light it throws upon, as well as receives from, the divine government in eternity, places it on such high grounds of truth, and brings into view such solemn and admonitory principles, that to the religious mind, as well as to the mere politician, the whole discussion must seem unspeakably important.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

ARGUMENT OF THE FIRST EVENING.

Mr. Cheever observed, before entering on his argument, that when requested to take part on this question, he determined not to do it, except as a deliberative discussion. He deemed it due to the greatness of the subject, and the character of his audience, to prepare his thoughts with more precision and clearness, than he could well give to them in the excitement of an agitating debate. The discussion being intended for two evenings, he separated his argument into two grand divisions, reserving for the second evening the whole branch of expediency, with all its deep interest, variety, and power.

He commenced with the passage, Genesis ix. 6, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

For the interpretation of this ordinance as a command, we have the authority, first, of the greatest com-

mentators that have ever appeared in the world. Among them I shall mention the names of Hammond, Grotius, Calvin, Matthew Henry, Michaelis, and Rosenmueller. Second, for the particular construction of the passage, according to the laws of the Hebrew language, we have the authority of the greatest Hebrew scholars that the world has ever known. If you will turn to the Hebrew grammars of Gesenius, Stuart, or Nordheimer, you will find that for the imperative in this case no other form could be used but that which is used, by man *shall* his blood be shed. The Hebrew imperative has no third person, and the future is always used in its stead. But not only so, the future supplies the form of the imperative throughout the whole decalogue, not one of the precepts of which is any more mandatory in its form than this ordinance. But this is not all: I can bring you a parallel passage from the book of Proverbs, (xxviii. 17,) by which you may see that even if you put aside the imperative form, the assertion in the ordinance is still of the nature of an injunction. "The man that doeth violence to the blood of any person shall flee to the pit; let no man stay him." That is, he shall immediately die. It cannot mean, he *will* flee to the pit, for he certainly will not if he can help it; but, he *shall* do this; he shall immediately be cut off; and to make this certain, it is added, Let no man stay him;—let no man interfere to save him;—let no man prevent, or seek to prevent, that immediate destruction, which is the penalty of his crime.

METHODS PROPOSED FOR EVADING THE FORCE OF THIS ORDINANCE.

It certainly is not wonderful that the advocates for the abolition of Capital Punishment should wish to evade the force of this statute: it is the citadel of our argument, commanding and sweeping the whole subject. All else is a mere guerilla warfare, if you cannot carry this entrenchment. In the matter of utility and expediency, we are in as strong possession of the ground as in the matter of the Scriptures and theology, and this I propose to show conclusively. The meaning of this statute is first to be settled, and defended from objections. Both the context and the interpretation show manifestly that it is a command, an injunction, a law. Two methods have been proposed for its annihilation; first, to render it *whatsoever* sheddeth man's blood, and to restrict its application to beasts; and second, to treat it as a mere prediction. I shall show the absurdity of these positions, and then proceed in my argument. The first position is impossible in the interpretation, since, if you even rendered it, *whatsoever*, it includes both man and beast. But it is still more absurd in its nature and consequences; for it amounts to this; that God, at the opening of the world, and in regard to the crime of murder, is legislating for brutes and not for men! If a wild beast, driven by hunger, or hunted and provoked, kills a man, capital punishment shall be executed upon him. If a man murders his fellow-man, no blood must be exacted. Suppose,

then, (to use a forcible illustration for which I am indebted to the kindness of a friend,) a malicious neighbor in that early age to have set a trained bloodhound on a man whose life he was seeking; and the obedient animal, true to his own nature, and an admirable instrument of murder for his master, takes the life-blood of his victim. Must the man be arraigned and executed on the charge of murder? By no means, say the humane expositors of this law of God; that would be to add murder to murder. Let the man escape, but the dog must be hung; the ferocious brute, that knew no better than instinctively to do what his master bade him, and so to slay a man made in the image of God, deserves to die. Let the the court proceed to condemn the blood-thirsty quadruped; and, to show the sacredness of human life, and protect society from the incursions of wild beasts, let the creature be solemnly executed; and let it be done in the sight of all the other beasts and bloodhounds you can summon to the spectacle; for the statute is, "*Whatsoever* sheddeth man's blood, by man shall *that beast's* blood be shed"!

Perhaps now you will choose to abandon this ground, and admitting that it refers to man, you contend that it is merely a prediction. Now mark the consequences. It is either manifestly false, and has not been fulfilled, or the prediction itself has caused its own fulfillment, and must have been given for this purpose. But supposing it to be a prediction, is it not a little singular that you yourself are opposing its fulfillment? If it be really what you say, a prediction of Jehovah, do you

believe that you can prevent its fulfilment? Certainly, if I thought God had predicted that every murderer should be punished with death, I should not dream of being able to prevent it. Your efforts against capital punishment are unavailing, if God has here predicted that capital punishment shall prevail. But not only so, they are presumptuously irreligious. The Emperor Julian, the apostate, to show his spite against Christianity, and to falsify one of its most important predictions, tried to build again the walls and temple of Jerusalem, but the hand of Heaven prevented him. You are trying to destroy an institution, which you yourself contend that God has predicted shall stand.

God either meant that the prediction should be fulfilled, or he did not. If he did, you are opposing God's intention, and endeavoring to prove him a liar. If you say that he did not mean it should be fulfilled, you make the sentence a nullity of idle words, and God a trifler. Moreover, you contend that capital punishment is wrong; in effect, you argue that it is a sin. Here, then, consequently, is a sentence from Jehovah, which you say is a prediction concerning the prevalence of a sin; but which is so worded, that the whole world for four thousand years have considered it a command, and acted upon it; the Hebrews themselves, under the very guidance of God, taking it as a law, and acting accordingly. Assuredly this supposes in the framer of such a prediction either wilful deception, or the most astounding stupidity. To put it in a strong light, let me ask what would you think, if God, intending to forbid stealing, had predicted that men will steal, but had

uttered this prediction in such a manner, that men for four thousand years should have interpreted it as a command to steal, and acted accordingly, the mistake never once being corrected in all after legislation! But, indeed, the efforts to evade this statute, involve absurdities in every direction.

PROOF OF THE UNIVERSAL APPLICATION, AND UNLIMITED DURATION OF THIS STATUTE.

THREE things are noted in this statute; its PRIORITY TO ALL LEGISLATION; ITS COMPREHENSIVENESS; AND ITS UNLIMITED DURATION. It comes immediately and solely from God. It was meant for all mankind. Its authority continues as long as the race. As it is solely from God, God only could repeal it. He never has repealed it, and it is just as binding upon us, as it was upon the generation to whom it was first given. If you deny its application to us, to nations and governments now, you must point out the place where its application stops. Is it in the first generation, when the scarcity of men, and their relationship with one another made it less necessary; or is it at an after period, when men and crimes increased together, so that every year that the race lived made it more necessary? It is the first law in the world; but not only so, it is the first law of God in the world. What subject would he be likely to legislate upon in such circumstances? One of temporary, transitory importance, or one which, beginning with the race, should last with the race? The law, as well as the covenant connected with it,

was intended, beyond all doubt, for all mankind; you cannot stand at any point in the stream of time, or the history of man, and tell me, There this legislation stops; you can no more separate its obligation now, from its obligation in the age of Noah, than you can stand at any point in the river that supplies this city with pure water, and tell me what particular drops find their way into the reservoir, and what not.

It is not to be denied that the covenant of God with Noah on this occasion covers the whole transaction; including the promise of a blessing, the grant of animal food, the ordinance in question, the command to be fruitful and multiply, and the assurance that there should be no future deluge. Now of this covenant God expressly says that it was meant for perpetual generations, as long as the world should stand, an everlasting covenant.

The comprehensive application and perpetual obligation of this law, for Noah, and his posterity to the end of time, unless revoked by the Divine Legislator, are as unquestionable as the right to eat animal food. This right was granted to Noah and his posterity for all mankind to the end of time, unless expressly revoked by the Divine Legislator. Does any man doubt it? Does any man believe that the grant to eat animal food was made only to Noah, or only to that generation, or only to the Hebrews? But the same arguments, which would throw off the binding force of this statute, would destroy the permissive force of this grant. You cannot show from this passage, that it is lawful for us to eat animal food, if you cannot also show that

it is binding on us to punish the murderer with death. You cannot point out, in God's after-legislation, any statute, which either revokes the grant or repeals the obligation. If its obligation ceased at any time, or with any race, *when* did it cease, and how did men know it? That the law continued to be fulfilled, we know from all history, both sacred and profane; when, or how, or by what agency did it cease to be a law, though its fulfilment continued?

In the terms of the law itself, there is positive proof that it remains, and is binding now. The common sense of law lays down a maxim, which no lawyer would set aside, on which this permanence may be established. It is this—*lex stat dum ratio manet;* the law stands while the reason remains. What was the reason for this law? Does that reason remain? The reason is connected *with* the law, and is given in God's own words; *for in the image of God made he man.* Does this reason still exist? Then assuredly, the law is still in force; for, however *men* may act without reason, and change without reason, God does not. The law remains while the reason remains.

This was in part the meaning of our Savior, when he said that not one jot or tittle should pass from the law, till all should be fulfilled; till its purpose should have been accomplished, or the reason should have ceased to exist. Are we made in the image of God? Then, on the strictest principles of reasoning, this law is still in force. A government now, is as much bound to put to death the man who kills his fellow-man, as the government, of whatever nature you choose to sup-

pose it, to sustain the authority of which this law was first promulgated. A government attempting to set aside or do away this law, transcends its sphere; it legislates against the divine legislation. It has no more right to do this than it has to abrogate the law against stealing. It is as great a solecism to commence the reformation of human legislation with the abrogation of this law, as it would be for a preacher of the gospel to commence the reformation of human society, by denying a divine revelation.

This law is as obligatory as any statute in the decalogue. Its authority, like that of the decalogue, is demonstrable, because the precept is a moral duty; a moral duty to society, a duty which a benevolent and wise regard to the interests of society renders binding. It is just as demonstrable as the authority of the principle, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But it has one point in its favor over and above the decalogue; because it was addressed *formally* to all mankind. The decalogue was *meant* for all mankind unquestionably; its essential nature, as necessary for man's highest interests, proves this. The *prefix* to the decalogue was limited; Hear, O Israel. The prefix to this statute against murder, was addressed to all the inhabitants of the world. In fact, this is one of the laws of the decalogue itself, with an invariable penalty stated. It is neither more nor less than the law, Thou shalt not kill, with the penalty for killing fixed by the lawgiver. This statute to Noah, and every statute in the decalogue, stands on the same basis of moral goodness, by the same moral necessity. The statute springs

out of what I may call the necessity of love—the necessity of watching over and protecting the welfare of society—the necessity of protecting the innocent against the passions of the depraved. The nature of goodness compelled the promulgation of this law. But a law is nothing without a penalty; and the same goodness that necessitates the law, necessitates also the penalty and the enforcement.

PROOF AND ILLUSTRATION OF THE MEANING OF THIS STATUTE FROM THE SUCCEEDING LEGISLATION AMONG THE HEBREWS.

Suppose now, that an intelligent being, having heard the first promulgation of this law to Noah, should have been transported to some distant quarter of the universe, not to return to this world for the space of twelve hundred years. Would he expect to find this statute in existence? And if he did find it in existence, with other similar statutes founded on it, would not this be an additional proof, if such were needed, of the universal and perpetual intent and obligation of this law? Let us then take the place of this supposed angelic being, and visit the world after twelve hundred years have passed away. We will not go to any barbarous, inhuman part of it, for you might say that such a race had interpreted this statute according to their own cruelty and ignorance. There is a bright spot on the earth's dark surface; you may know it by the mountain cedars, and the groves of palm trees. A supernatural radiance rests upon it, and a wall of light infolds and

circles it, reaching from earth to heaven. There is a temple there, but in it no idol is to be found; but only the sublime presence of the invisible God! Now let us open a book of the legislative wisdom of this elevated and favored people. "Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death by the mouth of witnesses. Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer which is guilty of death; but he shall surely be put to death. So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood, it defileth the land; and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. Defile not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit, wherein I dwell; for I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel." Num. xxxv. 30–34. Does this look like the abrogation of this law, or the cessation of its binding power? Nay, is it not the same law repromulgated far more explicitly, with the same reason annexed? "I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel." How remarkable is this language! How remarkable the inference! The more closely and nearly God condescends to dwell on earth among his creatures, the more invariably must this law of death to the murderer be executed!

Here I wish it to be distinctly understood, that in all reference to the Mosaic institutions so called, I make it not to gain from them a sanction for this law, but simply to show the light which they throw upon it. The law would stand upon the same unquestionable authority that it does now, if the whole mass of revelation between the book of Genesis and the gospel of Matthew were annihilated. But the *illustrative* character of the evidence

is wonderful. It is precisely like that which would be gained for any human law, by tracing in accordance with it a whole body of precedents and conclusions uninterrupted and unquestioned for hundreds of years.

There is a great distinction between the common law of the world expressed to Noah, and local enactments for particular reasons among the Hebrews. By those enactments we are not bound. The authority of the decalogue we do not put upon the fact that God gave it to the Jews, but that its principles are eternal, universal.

But perhaps you will say, This after all is but the childhood of society; the race is only struggling towards the perfection of humanity; thes eare but tentative processes in legislation, which must wait to be perfected in the nineteenth century. Let us then leave the world to its progress a thousand years longer. Where are we now? and what is the condition of humanity? The Creator and Savior of the world himself is there; God manifest in the flesh, the Wisdom and the love of Eternity, shedding its radiance through the veil of human nature, adopted in mercy to mankind. His words are all those of love, and God is love; and yet he speaks of death as well as life, of wrath as well as mercy, and threatens the one while he promises the other. You find at this period of our Savior's abode in Judea, a great abuse of the whole law with all its penalties, for the purposes of private revenge. Does the present Lawgiver abrogate this statute? No! He condemns most severely the *spirit of revenge*, but *confirms* the law, and corrects the mistakes of any who supposed he would destroy it. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law

or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill."

PROOF AND ILLUSTRATION FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, AND FROM PAUL'S EXAMPLE.

Step now, thirty years after the crucifixion of this blessed Being, into the zenith of civilization and splendor, the capital of the world, and there listen to a new voice of revelation on this subject. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Rom. xiii. 1–4.

Two things are to be specially noted in this passage; the Divine origin of government as an ordinance of God; and the power of inflicting death as the minister of God. If these two things be not recognized in this passage, then there is no meaning in it. The sword, as the symbol of power in the magistracy, indicated not an inferior power, merely; but the well-known highest power of life and death, which, as in all such cases, is taken as the symbol. This power Paul sanctions under the

Christian dispensation, as springing from and sustained by the ordinance of God. There is no other possible view that can be taken of the passage. There is in it no suggestion of any repeal of any law—no appeal to the milder genius of the Savior's dispensation—no appeal to the sermon on the Mount—no retreat from your savage genius of the Old Testament to the mild, forgiving spirit of the New ; but an unhesitating, explicit recognition and re-promulgation of the lawfulness and divine authority of the punishment of death by the magistrate, as the revenger of crime, the minister of God to execute wrath upon the guilty. The phrase " bearing the sword" could have been understood by those to whom Paul was writing only as referring to the power of death. The Roman government had not abolished capital punishment, nor was Paul writing to a community of Quakers. He was writing to those who would inevitably have understood him to reiterate as belonging to the magistracy under the Christian dispensation that power to take life, with which society was invested of God under the Noachic and the Jewish dispensation.

Let this argument be carried one step farther in order to test it in Paul's own conduct, and it becomes perfectly decisive. In his own person, at the judgment bar, Paul fully recognizes the justice and solemn authority of the penalty of death. " If I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die." Acts xxv. 11. Paul supposes that there are crimes worthy of death, and that a human government may rightly inflict the penalty of death for such crimes ; he requires a legal investigation in his own case, and if

by such an investigation, he be found to have done anything which deserves that penalty, he does not refuse to suffer it, he is willing to die. The argument thus tested in Paul's own experience, is perfect. It is incontrovertible, that so far from there being any abrogation of ordinance given to mankind through Noah, either in the letter, or by the spirit of the Christian dispensation, we find, in the very opening of that dispensation, a new and distinct promulgation of the same. Nor is this to be wondered at: for the legislation of God with Noah was as purely benevolent as the precepts of our Savior's sermon on the Mount.

SUSPICIOUS NATURE OF ANY ARGUMENT WHICH BEGINS BY DEPRECIATING THE AUTHORITY OF GOD'S WORD.

As to the light which this ordinance sheds upon the divine government, and the radiance which it pours over questions of the highest moment in human affairs, it is, amidst all the depravity, darkness, and bewildering schemes of men, like a sun shot into chaos. It is an orb of light. The attempts to destroy it are just as if you strove to pluck the planets from their places. Nor are the arguments by which its divine obligation is sought to be avoided, restricted, or explained away, any better than the false humanity that characterises the effort. An argument, which begins with a depreciation of the authority, or the excellence of any part of the word of God, is, from that very circumstance, suspicious. It would be better to yield up the whole benefit of an appeal to divine truth uncontradicted,

than to endeavor to ward it off by cavils against its authority, or sneers upon its barbarism. They who speak thus either of the Noachic or the Jewish econonomy, speak both ignorantly and presumptuously. There has never been a regulation under God's authority which was barbarous or injudicious. It was ever the highest wisdom; but divine wisdom itself is not an abstraction, but in its exercise regards circumstances: and therefore, if any enactment be manifestly local, the question we have to ask is not, Was such an ordinance meant for us? but, how far are our own circumstances so similar to those of the men for whom it was intended, as to make it applicable to us, wise for us? The remarks of a great philosopher on the Jewish economy, one who will not be suspected of religious prejudice, or blindness, are worth consideration. It is Schlegel, who has observed on this subject, that "in practical life, Reason serves as the divine regulator, in so far as it adheres to the higher order of God. But when it refuses to do this, and wishes to deduce all from itself, and its own individuality, then it becomes an egotistical, over-refining, selfish, calculating, degenerate reason, the inventress of all the arbitrary systems of science and morals, dividing and splitting everything into sects and parties." The same great writer has observed of the whole existence of the Jewish people, that "the keystone of its moral life projected its far shadows into futurity;" he might have observed the same of the ordinance given to Noah, which indeed is the keystone placed by divine wisdom in the magnificent arch of human legislation

constructed from on high. This, too, according to that noble expression, projects its far shadows into futurity; it is a prophetic miniature of the key-stone of divine justice and goodness in the government of God in eternity. You may see here an image of the infinite, in the finite, even as you may see the whole cope of heaven reflected in a dew-drop.

THE GREAT SACREDNESS AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN LIFE PRODUCED AMONGST THE HEBREWS BY THIS STATUTE.

I have now proved to you the original, comprehensive ordinance unshackled, unrestricted, bold, universal, in an authoritive annunciation as simple, clear, conclusive, as any command in the decalogue, with reasons as manifest, with cogency as great. I then prove to you afterwards additional particular statutes framed manifestly under the authority of this universal statute, in the legislation of a people who received this first book containing it as one of the portions of the Divine law; and this particular enactment as belonging to themselves, as one of the great families of mankind sprung from Noah;—which local statutes, though restricted to the Jews, look back to the great original statute as their fountain, and prove incontrovertibly that thus far that statute had never been repealed. I show these statutes to you couched in such terms, accompanied with such remarkable declarations as to the guilt of murder, that even in local enactments this crime has been manifestly singled out and held up to the world as an exception to all others, in admitting

no reprieve or repeal in any case whatever from its assigned penalty. There are no deeper colors, in which the pencil of inspiration itself is ever dipped.

It is astonishing to mark the jealousy of the Divine Being, lest the sympathy of his fallen creatures with sin, and their mistaken pity for the murderer instead of the murdered victim, should turn the course of justice from its prescribed channel. Doubtless the Divine Legislator had observed an unwillingness to follow his supreme wisdom, a readiness to connive at crime and clear the guilty, a readiness on the part of witnesses and of judges to perjure themselves, a sympathy produced partly by family influence, partly by the declamation of demagogues, partly by infidelity, and partly by the plausible pretence of a benevolence superior to God's. For a season, these explicit statutes prevailed to check these influences, and stay the crime of murder, so that, under the administration of the Judges it was so uncommon, that the whole nation from Dan to Beersheba rose up in a complicated case, to punish it. A noble state of public opinion, and produced entirely by the salutary power of these laws. But in after times the law grew again to be neglected, and this remissness in its execution is charged, against the nation as constituting one of its greatest sins, this carelessness of human life, and this permisssion of bloodshed without avenging it. Your hands are full of blood, says the prophet Isaiah, unavenged blood, and therefore you may be ever so religious in your prayers, but God will not hear them.

It is described as one of the characteristics of a reli-

gious man, which shall dwell on high, that he shutteth his hands from holding bribes, and stoppeth his ears from hearing blood; will not, for one moment, listen to anything, but the execution of the Divine law upon the murderer. All this is remarkable. And all these instances are proofs of the admirable character of the Jewish code: in no nation in the world, while it was observed, had human life any sacredness or protection compared with that experienced among the Hebrews. And in the period of that nation's greatest prosperity, the feeling of such sacredness, and the sense of the Divine law, had sunk down so deep into the soul of people and king, that David, about to depart from life, could not rest, while he remembered that the crime of murder in one of his own captains had gone unpunished. He was compelled by the invisible Spirit of Law and Justice, and Humanity too, to leave it as his dying injunction to Solomon, that the blood of Amasa and Abner, whom Joab slew, should be avenged as the Divine statute directed.

THIS STATUTE REPROMULGATED AND ESTABLISHED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Passing now from the argument among the Hebrews of the old dispensation, I carry you down to the period of the great re-enactment and publication of the Divine law by the Savior, its repromulgation under the form of love--which quality is the basis of all Divine legislation; for the restraint and punishment of vice in the vicious, grows out of love to the virtuous; and I prove

to you that at that time, and all along, before and after, there were cases of capital punishment, and that the authority and power of capital punishment is held undiminished, and of divine origin and sanction. I prove to you that in the time of the apostles this power is recognized as belonging to the magistracy, so that Paul apparently almost goes out of his way to reiterate it, and to hold it up as the highest delegation of power from God to man, emanating directly from the Divine Legislator. And I show you, that so far from any appeal being taken from this law to the law of Christ, it is confirmed by the gospel; and that, so far as our blessed Lord remarked upon the Mosaic institutions, it was not to condemn them, but the rapacity, cruelty, and oppression of the Jews abusing them, and turning their spirit of justice and love into malignity; not to repeal a single one of them, but to regulate their application. I prove to you, that even if our Lord had stricken out, with his own hand, any one of them, this would not have lessened the authority of those that remained; for till the same hand should blot them all away, no human authority should dare to do it. So that, as long as there cannot be found the slightest reference by our Savior to the law of death for murder; except it may be where he declares that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword, which saying, so far as it goes, is a reiteration of that law; even if he had said distinctly as to the law of retaliation by an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, It is all done away; which he never did say, but simply rebuked the spirit of private revenge making use of that law

as its instrument or for its concealment; this would not have the least bearing on the penal statute for murder, either to question, restrain, limit, or repeal it. Even supposing one statute of the Divine law repealed by its author, who dare take this example, and follow in the repeal of another, without a direct command from the Deity? This mode of reasoning is altogether presumptous and incorrect.

The precepts of our Savior are sometimes urged as if really the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ were contradictory. When the Savior says, Thou shalt love thine enemies, it is the same benevolence which speaks, The murderer shall surely be put to death. When God says, Resist not evil; Recompense to no man evil for evil; Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord; he speaks to individuals and not to the civil government; there could not be a more perfect obedience to this command, than when the avenging of the blood of a murdered man is put into the hands of the government, and God's own penalty is executed. This is God's own vengeance; this is God repaying, and not man. Your obligation to love your enemies, is no greater than your obligation to love the community. This train of thought is admirably developed by Rev. Mr. Thompson of New Haven. What it may be wrong for you to do as a private individual, it may be wrong for you *not* to do as a *citizen* or an officer of justice. You have no right to inflict a personal injury upon your neighbor, but to love him, though he be your enemy; even if he have murdered your own brother, you are bound to forgive him the

injury yourself; but you are also bound to bring him to justice. If you are a magistrate, and your neighbor or your enemy is brought before you charged with an offence against the laws, you are bound to inflict an injury upon him, by the penalty of law, and if the crime be murder, by death. If your dwelling should be set on fire at midnight, and one of your children murdered by your enemy, the Spirit of Christ commands you to forgive him personally, but it commands you also not to shield him from the penalty of the law. The same Spirit of Christ commands you, as you love the welfare of the community, to bring this murderer to justice, to have him arrested and put in prison to receive his doom. You yourself would be an enemy to the community, if you connived at his escape.

CONCURRENT PRACTICE AND OPINION OF THE WHOLE ANCIENT WORLD.

I have dwelt upon the existence of this law through the whole course of Jewish legislation, and the continual reference to it in the stream of Divine revelation. I cannot dismiss this point without noticing the strong corroboration our argument receives from the consentaneous legislation of the world from the time of Noah.

We have the unanimous concurrence and practice of the whole ancient world to sustain our interpretation of the Noachic ordinance. We have in the stream of Pagan and classical literature, a continual reflection and memory of its light. "Philosophers, legislators, poets," I speak in the words of one of our distinguished native scho-

lars, (Prof. Taylor Lewis), "all speak of it as derived from primeval tradition, and as coming from a source transcending the memory of history. It is the very precept which Aristotle produces, and with a striking resemblance in some of his terms to the language of the Bible, as an example of what he styles unwritten law, not peculiar to Athens, or Macedon, or Persia, but coextensive with mankind, and found among all nations, civilized and savage. The ancient poets, better expounders of the natural sentiments of mankind than the philosophers, ever speak of it as a law having something peculiarly sacred and holy about it, and differing in this respect from all other statutes, thereby intimating that special Divine origin of which we have so precise an account in the Bible."

TENOR OF THE GRECIAN POETS ON THIS POINT, AND ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HUMAN MIND, IN THE CASE OF THE INHABITANTS OF MELITA WITH PAUL.

I may add to this, that the voice of the Grecian poets especially, recognizes the proverb that "Murder will out;" and is an echo of that deep utterance, which God himself interpreted of inanimate nature, "*the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.*" You may find in the Greek poets a constant reverberation of that voice which in the book of Proverbs comes from heaven: "A man that doth violence to the blood of any person, shall flee to the pit; let no man stay him." It seems to be a law of the human mind, in the natural, social state, to sleep not, to rest not, until the spirit of the murdered victim is answered

in this appeal. There is an instinct for the punishment of murder by the death of the murderer; Cain himself manifested its power and its terror, when he said, "Every man that seeth me will slay me." The inhabitants of Melita manifested its power when they said, in the very spirit of a chorus in the Greek Tragedies, and of the word of God itself, as they saw the viper fastening upon Paul's hand, "No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, yet vengeance suffereth not to live." The word here means not so much vengeance, as the invisible, Divine Avenger—the ever-watchful Deity of Justice. This is one of the most remarkable expressions to be found on record, of the sense in the minds of the heathen, of the existence and providence of such a power. I may add, also, that this is an equally signal development of the innate idea of right, as applied to punishment. These men did not think of the good of society or the necessity of punishment for its protection; but they said, This man is a murderer; he *ought* to have been put to death; justice required it, and now justice hath overtaken him. In this they simply uttered the innate feeling of right—the inward sentence of the soul, to which every soul responds. It is right that the murderer should die. There was nothing vindictive—nothing revengeful in this feeling. It is the constitution of our nature to make us feel that crime demands punishment; it is not merely a suggestion of expediency—it as an instinct of our being.

To the argument from the scriptures I shall now add one more text, because standing at the close of

the Bible, it completes the golden chain of argument, running like a furrow of light through the whole Bible on this subject, from Genesis to the Apocalypse. It is this, from the Revelation of St. John, xiii. 10: "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." It is powerful for two reasons. First our marginal annotators, without any point to gain or any special pleading, have referred us for a scriptural comment on the meaning of this passage, to the ordinance in Genesis. Second, the impersonal Greek verb δει, which is here used, carries with it the sense of necessity, propriety, fitness, moral obligation. He that killeth with the sword, must, ought, shall be killed by the sword. This also is very like that proverb which I have quoted: "He that doth violence to the blood of any person shall flee to the pit: let no man slay him."

CONSIDERATION OF THE SLANDER THROWN UPON THIS STATUTE AS IF IT WERE VINDICTIVE—BENEVOLENCE OF THIS STATUTE.

This brings us to the consideration of the slander thrown upon this statute as if it were malevolent, revengeful, vindictive. The sophistry of our opponents is often mainly deployed upon this point. You are pleased to call it vindictive, and in this way seek to array against the punishment of malice, that feeling of indignation, which rises in a just mind against malice itself. Now it is perfectly clear, that in this legislation there is nothing malicious, nothing vindictive. It proceeds from love, from benevolence, from the absolute, humane necessity of preventing crime, and guard-

ing the world against it. Of all processes of law, that in which the murderer is condemned to death is the most solemn, deliberate, compassionate. The law never shows its majestic combination of immutable sternness, with the constant play of human sympathy more clearly. The benefit of every doubt is allowed to the prisoner; the court, judge and jury all wish that he may be proved innocent; the verdict of guilty is pronounced with hesitation and sorrow; the judge declares the sentence with reluctant humanity; the whole community, pressed on by the invisible, sublime power of that element, whose agency supports the universe, do nevertheless shrink back in horror and pity from the awful conclusion. All this proves at once the absence of every vindictive element; but demonstrates at the same time, the protective and salutary terrors of the punishment. The impression on the community is a most deep, salutary, beneficial one. The image of divine law and divine retribution is reflected as in a mirror to the inward prophetical vision of the soul. The thought of vindictiveness is the last that would enter the mind; the thought of the dreadfulness of the crime of murder, and the awfulness, immutability and certainty of justice, in its punishment, is roused. If any just penal inflictions *could* suggest the idea of vindictiveness, there are other modes of punishment, which would do it much more readily. Punishment by death is no more vindictive in its nature than imprisonment, than fine, than banishment. But the word itself is a sophism. It does not belong to justice, which is *vindicating*, but not *vindictive*. When you

apply it, you are guilty of a deliberate misstatement; you appeal to prejudice by an argument which you must know to be false.

It is not only not vindictive, but it is humane in the highest degree. That is true humanity, which looks to the highest good of the greatest number. In this view, all penalties of the divine law, and all just penalties of human law, are the offspring of benevolence. Your frowning prisons, in which living men are immured in a death to society, to love, to domestic tenderness, to nature, to the sweet changes of the seasons, to all that can render life desirable, on your reasoning are inhuman and vindictive in the last degree. The element of malice, if you charge it against the penalty of death, is more marked and manifest by far, in this penalty of a living death in perpetual imprisonment. When one of the trusted ministers of Louis XI. had betrayed his master, that tyrant kept him fourteen years in an iron cage in one of his grim castles. There was more vindictive malice in that act than in twenty executions. In all forms the just penalties of law are not vindictive, but benevolent.

MISTAKE CONCERNING THE NATURE OF BENEVOLENCE.

There is no mistake more general, than that concerning the nature of benevolence, the monstrous mistake of supposing that benevolence cannot punish. Nor is there any statute of the Divine law better adapted to correct that mistake, than this statute of capital punishment. The highest proof of malevolence would be not to punish, but to let sin prevail. In this

view, the evil which in this world follows the commission of crime, the evil which is attendant on sin in all its forms, is a necessary part of the demonstration of the Divine goodness. This being a world of sin, if it were not also a world of misery, you could not prove that God is a benevolent God. A being not benevolent would let mankind go on in their sins without any check. The miseries of mankind do, in this view, prove the goodness of God; and instead of needing an explanation or apology, as if they constituted a difficulty in God's government, they are absolutely necessary to demonstrate that we are under his government. They prove that a being of infinite goodness is at the head of affairs. Nor is there anything that proves this more truly, than the ordinance that whosoever sheddeth man's blood, shall himself die.

The retribution in this statute is an image of the divine retributive justice in eternity. Into this one statute the principles of the Divine government are concentrated; it is a prophetic image; and those who disregard the statute, and deny its principles, must, according to the warning even of a heathen philosopher, look that they be prepared for a future development, which may very much astonish them. It was Plato, and not a Calvinistic theologian, who said that the laws in the eternal world, the sisters of the laws in this world, will give their enemies a fearful reception in eternity.

CONCLUSION OF THE SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT.—NATURE OF THE ATTEMPT TO ABOLISH THIS STATUTE.

Here I must for the present rest the argument, but I leave it on an immovable foundation. The argument from expediency against the abolition of Capital punishment is equally strong, the divine will and wisdom being the highest possible expediency; it will lead me over a path of the deepest interest, both in the statement of the argument itself, and in answering the objections brought against the statute as it stands, where we hope it ever will stand, in our codes of law, and is happily and humanely practised, where we hope it ever will be practised, in our Courts of Justice.

The attempt to abolish it is the array of the opinion of a few persons, at a particular juncture of time, against the dictate of divine wisdom, and the wisdom and experience of all nations, in all states of society, in all ages of the world. It is a hardy enterprise, this opposition, as it has been admirably stated, of the *vox populi* of the present moment against the *vox Dei* of the Scriptures, and the *vox humanitatis* of the whole human race. But the opponents of this law have not even the *vox populi* to sustain them; it is a mistake if they assert this to be the popular opinion; the appearance of it is only the assertion of it by themselves with the unsubstantial echo, but not the voice. I rejoice in feeling sure that this is the case, that the popular feeling, and the benevolent feeling, are in favor of this law. I believe in general, and we have the history of the French revolution to support the opinion, that the very

same men who sometimes clamor the loudest for the abolition of Capital punishment, on account of the vaunted humanity and enlightened public opinion of the day, would be the persons, if a tempest of public opinion happened to sweep in favor of Lynch-law, who would drag a man even from the safety of the prison, and hang him on the nearest lamp-post.

Public opinion may be mistaken at a particular juncture—often is. And we wish it to be considered whether any one generation of human society is capable of deciding, by its own experience even, the fitness or the unfitness of a law, which God has seen best to promulgate for the human race. Before all experience, we should judge that a legislation intended for six thousand years would very probably pass over intervals of time and phases of society, in which the particular application of its wisdom might not seem so manifest—might possibly be deemed questionable. But should we say that the doubt or the question engendered by particular circumstances, or by one people, could justify the race in altering or repealing such legislation? Should a law intended for a thousand years, be repealed because the experience of one of those years seems to run not accordant with the line traced by the reason of that law? Proportioned to the importance and unchangeable wisdom of this law, is the universality of its publication. There is no nation so barbarous, no period of the world so rude, degraded, ignorant, that has not known it, that has not possessed it, however simple and informal may have been the elements of legislation. There is no nation that has risen to refine-

ment and vigor of mind enough, to embalm in an undying literature, the voice, the opinion, the experience, of morality and prudence, that has not spontaneously echoed and sanctioned this statute, as if it were as much the dictate of man's being as of God's wisdom. It stands at the opening of an early and unpolluted world, before one drop of blood, save that of a hallowed sacrifice, had bedewed the earth, yet fresh and moist from the cleansing deluge. Before there was room for a single emotion but of gratitude and love, it was revealed as one grand element, not of revenge, but of blessing, in the Divine covenant with the human race.

The hand that drew the rainbow over the sky, in sign "that storms prepare to part," wrote this statute in lines no more to be effaced till the destruction of all things, than the colors of the rainbow can be blotted from the sky, while lasts the constitution of this physical universe. And as in every conflict of the elements that might fill men's souls with terror of another deluge, this bow of mercy, this vision of delight, should span the clouds with the glittering arch, so in every storm of human passion, that rises to the violence of death, this statute, as a bow of promise, is God's assurance to the world, against the anarchy of murder. There probably never was an instance of murder in the Christian world, in which men did not think of it; nor ever an instance in the heathen world, in which the voice of conscience did not echo its assurance. As it stands in the Scriptures, it is one of the planets in the firmament of revealed truth; to strike it out from its place, and from its authority for the guidance of human legis-

lation, would be like striking the constellation of the Pleiades, or the bright North Star, from heaven. A great writer has said, with most profound wisdom, that it is only by celestial observations that terrestrial charts can be accurately constructed; and so, it is only by the divine light that comes down from these divine statutes, that human legislation can be perfected; it is only by comparison with these statutes, that the mistakes of human prejudice or ignorance can be detected and adjusted. Sure we are, that on the ocean of human passion, neither states nor individuals can be safe, but by charts, mapped and marked beneath the light of these enactments. It is light, like that of the planets, has travelled unaltered and unabated across the storms and changes of thousands of years; and still it shines, and still will it shine to the end of the world; for as sure as we are that a God of mercy gave this comprehensive element of law to Noah, so sure we are that he will never suffer it to be blotted from human statute books, by the presumptuous tampering of a single generation.

ARGUMENT OF THE SECOND EVENING.

In the opening of his second argument, Mr. Cheever, in answer to the cavils of his opponent, spent some time in correcting certain important misinterpretations and misapplications of Scripture. He also critically examined the Noachic statute, and brought additional proof of the grammatical accuracy of our English translation of it, exposing again the absurd consequences of the suppositions by which its binding force is sought to be evaded.

An objection is sometimes brought against the binding and perpetual obligation of the Noachic statute, that if you take it as we contend, you must also take the prohibition not to eat blood. This is worth noticing. I might contend that this is simply a prohibition against a species of cannibalism, for it is not the blood that is forbidden solely, but the flesh with the blood. But I apply to this prohibition the same reasoning as to the injunction. It is of force while the reason for it remains. It was given in reference to the sacrifices which were to constitute the standing type and prediction of the great sacrifice of the Messiah for the sins of the world. To make that rite more sacred, to maintain the idea of the solemnity and sacredness of religious sacrifices, in which so deep and holy a life and mean-

ing was in the blood of the victim, this prohibition was laid down against eating the blood with the flesh. As long as the rite of sacrifices lasted, the force of this prohibition stood, because the reason for it remained; but when sacrifices and types were abolished, the particular binding force of this prohibition fell with it, the reason for it no longer existing. But this does not affect in the least degree that great injunction of the punishment of death for murder. If the reason for that command could be shown to be no longer existing, then the injunction itself would fall, but not otherwise. *Lex stat, dum ratio manet.* The reason remains. We are made in God's image; every generation to the end of the world will be; therefore, on every generation this law is binding.

ENORMITY OF THE GUILT OF MURDER, AND NECESSITY OF A PENALTY THAT SHALL MAKE IT PARAMOUNT IN ITS RETRIBUTION, AS IT STANDS IN ITS GUILT.

There is no computing the enormity of the guilt of murder. It stands alone, and unapproached by any other crime in its atrocity. Its intrinsic enormity, and its dreadful consequences are such that we need not wonder at the language in which it is described and denounced by Jehovah, nor at the penalty of death affixed to it. It is right, it is benevolent, it is necessary, that such a crime should invariably, without any exception in any case whatever, be punished with the extremest penalty of which heaven has annexed the authority to human law. There ought to be such a penalty, high, awful, distinctive, to mark this crime in its *retribution*, as it

stands in its *guilt*, paramount to every other. The conscience of society should be educated in the view of such a penalty; and if it were not, or when it is not, poor and cheap indeed is the estimate placed upon the sacredness of human life.

The object of all punishment is benevolent, it is the well-being of the community. It is to prevent crime by supporting law. The penalty of the law must be an evil, which the man intending crime will balance against the good he proposes to himself by the crime. He must fear the evil more than he desires the good. Do you say that men commit crimes in passion, and that there is seldom this balancing of motives and considerations? I answer, this may possibly be true in regard to all minor penalties, and this is one strong argument for having in the case of murder so terrific, strong, overbearing a penalty, that it shall break down all other considerations, that it may stem the torrent of passion, that the criminal may hear a voice amidst the roar of the tempest of passion commanding him to refrain.

STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION OF EXPEDIENCY.

Now, it being granted that the murderer deserves to die, and that society have the right in some cases to inflict the punishment of death, the question of expediency before us is simply whether punishment by death operates more effectually to prevent the crime of murder than any other penalty. Now, then, who are they from whom we have to fear murder? Any man may become a murderer with sufficient temptation; but in

general it is men already hardened by crime, from whom the crime of murder is to be feared; it is men urged by want, outcasts from society, beings with whom life is already so deprived of comfort, of respectability, of happiness, that a jail with its food and clothing would be almost a relief instead of a punishment, while death would be the most terrific of penalties. It is manifest that there is almost no good motive to restrain such persons from crime. There is nothing but fear that will do it. But the fear of the prison is almost changed into a relief at the thought of its shelter. With the penalty of death it is very different. Here you appeal to a terror as far greater than all others, as the crime itself of murder is greater than all others. "In all secondary punishments," remarks a legal writer, "it is assumed that the convict is well fed, well clothed, well lodged, and well attended to. He may have no luxuries and few comforts, but he has entire security against starvation or want, perfect protection against the weather, and certainty of medical assistance in case of sickness. To the unthinking multitude the secrets of the prison-house can never be fully revealed, and there will always be some room for doubt and hope as to the lot of the convict. The executioner alone inflicts a punishment, of which the sufferings can never be called in question."

I may add to this, that you may put what guards you will about your plan of imprisonment, to make it perpetual, there will always be hope of escape. Criminals sentenced to imprisonment for life, have ordinarily, on an average—if you take this State for an exam-

ple—spent in prison about six years! But even if you made the date absolutely immutable, there will always be murderers, who, with the ingenuity of Baron Trenck, could almost eat their way through stone walls, as easily as they could eat the heart out of their own humanity. Or if not, a villain who will commit a murder that brings him into prison, would not not hesitate a moment to commit one that shall take him out.

POWER OF THE FEAR OF DEATH AS A PUNISHMENT—ILLUSTRATED IN THE CASE OF COLT.

Indeed, there is nothing that can possibly check the spirit of murder, but the fear of death. That was all that Cain feared; he did not say, people will put me in prison, but, they will put me to death; and how many other murders he may have committed when released from that fear, the sacred writer does not tell us. Nor is it anything but this, that the whole progeny of murderers, from Cain downwards, ever fear, nor anything but this fear that ever will restrain them. They fear the same tremendous evil which they inflict on others, but nothing else.

And you may range the whole Newgate Calendar, with the experience of all gentlemen elopers with the estates of heiresses, who, like Gilbert Wakefield, have got into it; and you may tell as much as you please of the insensibility of obdurate villains even in the face of death; but such testimony weighs no more against the power of the fear of death in all mankind, than the testimony of a perjurer and a murderer would weigh against an honest man's testimony in a court of

justice. But if it did weigh, what does it prove? Why, that, there are such monstrous villains, so steeled and inveterate in wickedness, that death itself has no terror for them; but certainly if they do not fear death, they fear imprisonment still less; and if they would murder even with the fear of death before them, much more will they murder when that fear is taken away. Besides, if because a villain says that he neither fears your law nor its deadly penalty, you bring that as a reason for abolishing the penalty, suppose another knot of villains tell you that they do not even fear God, nor his terrific penalty; the same reason would be just as good for striking that penalty from the government of the universe. Or if another gang tell you that they care not a fig for your perpetual imprisonment, then by parity of reasoning, you ought to abolish perpetual imprisonment. The reasoning from these drivellings of depravity in malefactors is to the last degree wretched and absurd. Hard pushed indeed must he be in argument, who can consent to dive down into the polluted heart of a Newgate criminal, in order to fish up, from the confession of his monstrous, unnatural obduracy, an argument in that very obduracy against the fit punishment of his own crimes.

I think there is a testimony from criminals sometimes elicited as to the real fear of death, which it may be well to set over against all this. It is that rather than die by the penalty of the law, they sometimes kill themselves. But who ever heard of a man killing himself to avoid imprisonment? What malefactor, whom the officers of justice were carrying to prison, if

the populace should try to kill him, would not cry lustily for help? You cannot believe that the wretched Colt would have killed himself, if his punishment had been merely imprisonment instead of death. Besides, what language was it which was spoken in that hurrying and anxiety to have his sentence commuted, that intense effort on the part of counsel, friends and criminal for this purpose. Well then, a punishment which the criminal fears more than death, must be of all others most powerful to restrain from crime.

But you object that it *leads* to suicide. We answer, that it places suicide itself as a terrific consequence of crime, a terrific form of vengeance uprising behind the shade of the murdered man to the murderer's own view. It places the crime of murder on one side—a public execution or suicide on the other, with no possible alternative. Now the whole system of criminal jurisprudence goes upon the supposition of a future state of retribution, the supposition that men believe it, and that no man will flee voluntarily from this to that. It does not contemplate, and it ought not, a state of society, in which men's fear of a future judgment is taken away. It contemplates that judgment; and its highest last, most awful resort, when men commit the highest, last, most awful crime, a crime from which all lesser penalties are unavailing to restrain them, is to hand the criminal over to that dread tribunal, which alone can deal with him. It seems to me that in this point we have a most solemn connecting link between God's jurisprudence and our own. God's high court has a passage from our inferior one; and in the case of this

crime, it is as if God had said, Here you can do nothing but to hand the criminal over to his last judge; he has passed that limit, in which it was possible to permit men to sin under the jurisprudence of probation.

OBJECTION CONSIDERED, OF THE UNCERTAINTY OF THE PENALTY.—SALUTARY POWER OF THE PENALTY OF DEATH FOR MURDER, AS CERTAIN.

I am not now arguing for the restraining power of an uncertain penalty, but of a penalty, which, restricted to the crime of murder, shall be made absolutely certain. One of your objections against punishment by death is the uncertainty of its execution, and that this uncertainty renders the penalty itself ineffectual. Very true; and this very uncertainty, and the consequent weakening of the power of law and of its protective energy to the community, is in part owing to men's injudicious efforts against this penalty. They act some of them from a warm heart, no doubt, but not from a wise and large philanthropy. This uncertainty, with all this whimsical scrupulosity of jurors, is not a little produced by that mawkish sensibility, which weeps over the fate of the murderer, but forgets the murdered victim, and neglects the protection of the innocent.

Now to test this fear of death, and its power for preventing crime, put aside these uncertainties, from whatever cause produced. Make the penalty certain. Suppose the intended criminal to know that the public eye is on him, that Justice will not sleep till he be detected, that such is the virtuous state of feeling in the community, such the regard to God's law, such the sense en-

tertained of the sacredness of human life, and of the enormity of the crime of murder, that no effort or expense will be spared to bring him to justice, and that if brought to justice, he will inevitably be executed; that no jury will entertain any false scruples, that no false sensibility will be exercised towards the murderer, that no deputations from the bar will be hurrying to and fro for his pardon, but that there will be such a humane regard for the murdered victim and the interests of society, as will surely avenge his death—I say, suppose all this, which is what we contend for, and then the murderer sees at once that to take the life of another man is just to take his own. He might just as well commit suicide as murder. He plunges the dagger into his own bosom, when he strikes it into that of his neighbor. And how often do you suppose he would thus strike it if this were the case? Why, it would restrain the angriest, most passionate malignity. The truth is, it would be the very perfection of jurisprudence, if you could make murder a suicidal act: the crime of murder would well-nigh cease from existence. Put your statute on the right basis, and you do make it such. Throw away your absurd reasonings, your cavillings against the laws of God and man, and make the execution of the penalty of death for murder absolutely certain, and its restraining power against crime is immeasurable. This is the reformation we need; not the abrogation of this penalty, but the putting it where God puts it for all mankind, as the penalty alone for murder.

THE PROTECTIVE POWER OF THIS PENALTY FOR SOCIETY. —NECESSITY OF HAVING THE GREATNESS OF THE GUILT OF MURDER MARKED TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE MURDERER, BY THE PENALTY.

I have proved the restraining influence of this penalty in preventing crime. Next as to its protective influence for society. It is manifest that this is just proportioned to its restraining influence over the criminal. Whatever prevents crime, protects society. Now, your abrogating course is so far from giving society protection, that it is almost an invitation to murder. Let us trace the course of things. *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus.* No man becomes a murderer at once. A man begins his career with small steps. From his father's house forth into the wilderness of crime he goes timidly. But the tenderness of his conscience is gradually destroyed, and one crime and another is committed it may be with impunity. The penalty of discovery he has often faced, and become accustomed to look at it calmly and to balance consequences. Disgrace, fine, imprisonment, all these are evils that may be borne. If the worst ensues, still life remains, and there is hope in ingenuity, and even in guilt. But at length his steps in crime have brought him to the verge of murder. His victim is before him. Perhaps it is a rich, gray-haired old man, sleeping calmly in his bed at midnight. The dagger is lifted. Now, between this crime about to be perpetrated, and every lower crime, there is a vastness of separation which the mind cannot fathom. It is invested with horrors; it puts

whole coils of serpents in the conscience; it has a redness and a blaze of guilt, which, if any symbol could mark them, ought to be set up in open day to the universe, ought to be made to flash like a sword of fire upon the soul. But your hardened man of guilt does not see this. And what have you done to remind him of it? What separating wall have you raised to keep his soul from the damnation of this guilt, of which God himself hath said that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him? He has come to the verge of murder. What is there now to stay him? What writing on the wall, what external sign, what additional terror to rouse up his conscience, and show him the tremendous depths of the gulf he is about passing? What is there to show him that the step he is taking is not one of his previous degrees of crime, but a convulsive, awful sweep of his being into a depth of guilt, compared with which the whole previous iniquity of his life is as nothing? You have put no mark here. You have torn down the barrier, which God himself had erected in mercy to the criminal as well as to the innocent. You have taken away the landmark, the warning which God himself has put up for all mankind, and which assuredly marks a mightiness of guilt and of terror in the next step of evil, which nothing but the wide difference between the penalty of death and every lower penalty could mark. You must have such a mark; the soul of humanity calls upon you for it; the blood of every murdered victim crieth from the ground; you are guilty of a monstrous iniquity if you blot it out; for there is no comparison between the

madness, the ruthlessness, the monstrousness of murder and every other crime. In mercy to your fellow-creatures, you are called on to distinguish it from every other, by a penalty which, like that statute of God—that statute of mercy at the world's opening, stamped the conviction of its iniquity into the soul of mankind.

I have taken the case of a man whose successive steps in crime have brought him to the verge of murder, as a new and separate guilt. But suppose him to be brought to the verge of murder while in the commission of some other crime, and in order to conceal it, then the argument becomes vastly more powerful. While the Tempter is whispering, If I take this man's life, I may conceal my crime, conscience and the law should answer, You die for it. The ministers of justice will be infinitely more keen in your pursuit, the eyes of the whole community will be flashing for you, mere suspicion will detect you, your own conscience will lead you to discovery; and death, temporal and eternal is before you. The motive for the concealment of crime is so powerful an incentive to murder in such a case, that we are bound to guard against it. But to abolish this penalty is directly to throw the temptation of murder in the way of a criminal, who, perhaps, otherwise would not have dared to think of it, even for the concealment of crime. To abolish this penalty is to make murderers out of common villains. They will murder to conceal their other crimes, as soon as you reduce the penalty for murder to the same level with that for others. The penalty for murder being no greater, they are no worse off, even if dis-

covered. Without the murder, perhaps discovery is inevitable, and imprisonment must ensue. With the murder, even if discovered, the penalty can be no more than imprisonment. But by the murder the whole crime may be concealed, and the murderer may come off completely clear. It is manifest in such a case that nothing but this penalty can protect society.

INJUSTICE AND INHUMANITY OF THE ABOLITION OF THE PENALTY OF DEATH FOR MURDER.

I have shown that this penalty is necessary for the restraint of crime and the protection of society. I shall now show that the proposed abolition of it is unjust and inhuman in the last degree. It is a policy, the cruelty and barbarism of which is susceptible of a perfect demonstration. It introduces the element of inhumanity into the very education of society. Your jurisprudence is a most important part of your education for the community. It trains the common conscience. But in the abolition of this penalty, you occasion a general degradation of the moral sense; you teach that there is no difference between the guilt of murder, and that of mere forgery and stealing. You lessen men's estimate of the sacredness of human life, and you are unconsciously training men's passions for the cruelty of murder. You degrade the whole subject and science of morals; for this is at the foundation of it, involving all its principles. You give place and full swing to duelling, bloody riots, and private revenge. What you refuse as a government to do for the family and friends of the murdered man, and for the interests

of the community, you may be sure the malignity of private revenge will not fail to accomplish. You take away the strong security of your police, and you expose the lives of your jail-keepers to imminent hazard. A most faithful and vigilant police officer, since the abolition of capital punishment has been spoken of as a probable thing, has had his own life threatened, and the lives of others in his presence, and when he has told the villain that his own life must pay the forfeit of such a crime, the answer has been, "There is no fear of that in these days." The police officer added, that if the law should deprive him of this protection, he should be afraid to go to haunts of crime, which in the support of the law, he now visits. Who indeed, what public servant, either in this city or in London, would dare plunge into the recesses of crime to ferret out the villain, if the strong fear of this penalty did not go before him?

OBJECTION CONSIDERED OF THE DANGER OF MISTAKING THE INNOCENT FOR THE GUILTY.

Your zeal for the abolition of this penalty may be the zeal of love, but it is the logic and philanthropy of cruelty and murder. It is a most inhuman neglect of the interests of the innocent, to save the forfeited lives of abandoned villains, the example of whose security will sharpen the appetite of all other murderers, and who will certainly themselves murder again, if they can get out of prison. It is a philanthropy that pays no regard whatever to the unquestioned fact that thousands of murders have been prevented by this pen-

alty, thousands of innocent men saved, and innocent families preserved from the stab of the assassin, but with a morbid, diseased, pseudo-benevolence it rakes the records of crime for those mistakes to which human imperfection necessarily exposes human legislation, and if in one hundred cases false executions can be made out in two thousand years, it regards the lives of a thousand innocent persons saved from the murderer as nothing in the comparison. Ten innocent persons killed by mistake in two hundred years, are more than a balance against the lives of a hundred innocent persons who would have been killed by the murderer, had it not been for this penalty. The truth is, your statistics and calculations of profit and loss on human life, are, as has been admirably said, the arithmetic of Judas Iscariot, the calculations of the price of innocent blood.

Now that I have met this objection of the danger of mistaking the innocent for the guilty, allow to me to demolish it more fully. There is the same danger against all punishments. False *imprisonments* occur, and are not discovered till many years have elapsed. Is that an argument against imprisonment for crime? Suppose you could be assured that there had been one hundred cases of false imprisonment for life in the course of English jurisprudence, would you deem that a justifiable ground for the abolition of imprisonment for life? But let us grapple a little closer with these cases. They are given, most of them, in a former edition of Phillip's Treatise on Evidence, and they constitute, it has been said, the stock in trade of the prisoner's counsel in all murder trials. "Whoever will exa-

mine these cases, will find that in almost every instance, except those in which the *corpus delicti* was not found, and it appeared afterwards that no murder had been committed, the real culprit has taken away the life of the innocent prisoner by perjury, or, which amounts to the same thing, by arraying and directing a set of circumstances so as to implicate him. The amount of it is, that the murderer, in addition to the murder already committed, has made use of an institution of justice, instead of the assassin's knife, to perpetrate another. There is, in such cases, an additional murder committed, not by the law, nor by its ministers, nor yet by the State, which gave them their authority, but by the wretch, who has brought upon himself the guilt of a double murder to prevent the detection of one. There may therefore occur now and then, with extreme rarity, an instance in which a murderer will seize upon this law to commit another murder, for the purpose of screening the one already committed." But if on this account, you abolish the penalty of death to avoid these cases of murder in the second instance, you at once increase the number of murders in the first instance. You relinquish the reality of justice to snatch at its shadow. This objection is not good against the penalty, though it is of use in enjoining the utmost carefulness in criminal trials; but still we must keep the law, because we are certain that the abrogation of the penalty would lead to tenfold more murders, than can possibly be committed through the abuse of it. The example of our Savior is in point in a case analogous. The Jews in his day abused the law and its penalties

for their purposes of private revenge. Did he on this account abrogate the law, or take away the penalties? Not at all, but confirmed them both, while he forbade the abuse of them.

DEMONSTRATION CONTINUED OF THE INHUMANITY AND INJUSTICE OF THE ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Having disposed of this objection, I proceed now to prove more fully the injustice and inhumanity of the effort for the abolition of this penalty. You are unjust, if you do not give to society the same means of self-defence against assassins, which they relinquish for the protection of the government. Men do not wear arms—but why? Because of the solemn assurance that the government will protect life in the same way, if need be, in which weapons of death protect it;—because of the knowledge that the criminal is aware, if he takes life, that his own will be taken. Now to take away this penalty is in fact to take away from the community the means of self-defence. It is to make cowards of the innocent, but brave men of the guilty; for what man, for example, will dare defend his property, if a villain sets upon it, when the very defense may make the villain murder him, you having taken away from the villain himself all fear of death, no matter what crime he commits. If a man breaks into your house at midnight, with the knowledge that the punishment for murder is death, though that for housebreaking is not, you might be ready to confront him, and defend your property; but if you take away this penalty, you paralyse your own arm, and you nerve that

of the house-breaker with tenfold desperation, since he may finish his villainy with success if he murders you, and if he be caught the punishment for murder, at all events, is no greater than that for housebreaking, and if he does not murder you when you have confronted him, he is in danger of discovery at any rate. You are therefore rendered defenceless in an attack upon your property by the security of your adversary's life; or if at all events you do attempt to defend your property, and discover or drive away the villain, you are almost sure to be murdered, if he can murder you, for his life is safe, while the taking of yours is perhaps necessary to his success. He bears a charmed life, the consciousness of which unnerves you, but nerves him. Just so, if your person be assaulted, and you resist, your very defense is likely to procure your murder, for you are the helpless one, your assailant has all the advantage; the assassin cannot be killed, he is secure by law; but if he kills you, he may escape completely. To abolish this penalty would therefore be gross injustice and inhumanity both to the innocent who are murdered, and to the innocent living. It is securing the murderer against death, but exposing the community to death by the hand of any villain, who, knowing that his own life is protected by statute, chooses to kill. It is, in fact *a premium on murder, as the safest of crimes.* If you commit any lower crime, you may be punished for it too much. If you commit this crime, you are sure of a punishment less than the evil you inflict upon others. The glaring injustice and inhumanity of such an arrangement is perfectly obvious.

Now to fasten this argument with incontrovertible power, I shall refer you to a case, which though it is on record, I have received from a near relative of the monster concerned. The creature in his passion held an axe over his wife's head, and told her that nothing but the law saved her life. "I would kill you in a moment," said he, "if I did not know that I would have to swing for it." I appeal to the good sense and humanity of our audience, is not that a benevolent statute, which extends over that lonely and wretched mother the only protection for herself and children? And is not that a most inhuman effort, which seeks to take away from before that brutal husband the fear of death, which, as he himself says, is all that now restrains him? Which is the spirit of Christ? the spirit that vindicates the law, and protects the community, or the spirit that takes away at once the dreaded penalty of the law, and the protection of the innocent? Which is the benevolent effort? that which throws its shield over the murderer's life, but gives up the unprotected victim to his malice, or that which binds and holds back the arm of the murderer, by making his own death the certain consequence of his intended crime?

THE STATISTICAL ARGUMENT—ITS WEAKNESS AND ITS SOPHISTRY.

We come next to the statistical argument of my opponent. And I have to say at the outset that it is of such a nature that you cannot trust it. The argument from statistics, so far as it is gathered from all offences

below the crime of murder, does not bear upon the question of capital punishment for murder at all; but if it did, your induction is so narrow, so many causes are unnoticed, and the phases and influences of society are so changeable, that the results of your figures in a question of morals are likely to be utterly fallacious. It is often said that figures cannot lie, but you may marshal them in such a way, as to make them tell a falsehood in one direction, while they speak the truth in another.

Nor can there be anything more palpably false, and yet very plausible, than the mode sometimes adopted in arraying these statistics. Here is a country, for example, in which the penal code annexes death to several crimes, but in which, for a number of years, from various causes, crime has diminished; of course capital punishments have diminished also. The murders have not diminished because capital punishments have diminished, but the capital punishments have diminished because the murders have diminished. Now your industrious statistic gatherers take these facts. They put the diminution of the capital punishments first, and the diminution of the murders as the consequence. In one column you see a decreasing ratio of capital punishments, in the opposite a decreasing ratio of murders. Ergo, the diminution of capital punishments has diminished the murders! This is not exactly, according to the vulgar but pithy saying, the cart before the horse, but it is rather the horse behind the cart. And I think I need not labor to

expose either the absurdity of such statistics, or of the conclusions drawn from them.

When I hear men reason on the amelioration of a penal code, and then ascribe to this one cause the whole diminution of crime in society, it seems to me much as if Dr. Brandreth should state how many million boxes of his pills society have taken in the last half dozen years, and then having shown a diminution of diseases in that period, attribute the whole improvement in the health of mankind to his pills. The truth is, that this same diminution of crimes would have been produced by other existing causes, which undoubtedly are at the foundation of it. The decrease of intemperance, the influence of Sabbath schools, the prevalence of a better education, an increased attendance on the preaching of the gospel, are sufficient to account for improvements in society, which you trace directly to a change in the penal code; but if not, what a manifest absurdity it is to set up the experience of half a dozen years, in a State, which on the map of Europe you may cover with a sixpence, the experience for example of Belgium, only since 1830, and even that experience most doubtful in itself, and most imperfectly known, against the practice, reason, belief, and experience of all mankind, in all states of society, in all ages of the world. If I chose to reason in this way, I could show you statistics in the recent experience of England, to offset the experience of Belgium. For example, it is well known, from valuable tables constructed by Rev. Mr. Redgrave, of the Home Office, and annually presented to Parliament, that since the

removal of the penalty of death from two hundred offenses in 1837, there has been a very considerable increase of those offenses, an increase of no less than thirty-eight per cent. What shall we make of this? Shall we say that it proves that the penal code of England ought not to have been ameliorated? This would be the logic of my opponent, but I say no. The facts are not broad enough to justify the conclusion. There must be a much longer experiment, a much wider and more careful induction, and after all, even if those offenses should be found still to increase, that would not justify the applying to them again the penalty of death.

CAUSE OF THE PREJUDICE AGAINST THIS PENALTY.—REAL NATURE OF THE STATISTICAL ARGUMENT.

Now with regard to the crime of murder, the case is wholly different. It ought to stand apart in its penalty from all other crimes. And it is the annexing of the penalty of death to so many other crimes that has made the whole difficulty. Death has been taken from the hand of the Divine Legislator, from the place he assigned to it as a penalty, and most wantonly, most barbarously, most indiscriminately applied to minor offenses, in such wise, that the mind is filled with horror at the sanguinary and oppressive nature of such codes. Hence a prejudice against the infliction of this penalty in any case. Hence has it proceeded that it has become a mere threat, in many cases not executed. Hence the unwillingness of juries to convict. Hence

too the penalty of death has lost its preventive power against crime, even the crime of murder; nay, being applied to minor offences, it follows naturally that murder itself would be committed to conceal them. Now here is the secret of the apparent weight of the statistical argument, which in reality bears not in the least degree against the punishment of death for murder, but only in favor of restricting that penalty to the crime of murder. Nothing can be more idle than to array before us statistics in regard to minor crimes, taken from countries where in the penal code there has been a great abuse of this penalty of death. It has nothing to do with our argument. The penalty of death, you say, being abolished, crime has decreased. What does this mean? Is it a new principle in human nature developed, whereby men will sin the more, the more they have to suffer for it? Not at all. The solution of the riddle is just this. When the penalty of death was common for minor offences, men committed murder in the hope to conceal their common crimes. Now the penalty of death being taken away from such minor offences, such murders for the concealment of those offences cease, unless you take away the penalty of death from murder also. This is the true account of the matter. Now if, falsely reasoning from this amelioration, you carry your repeal of the penalty of death even to the crime of murder, you destroy all the good you have effected, and bring back the whole evil where it was before, nay, much worse; that is, inasmuch as you annex to murder no more dreadful consequences than to other crimes, a man will now commit murder

to conceal his other crimes, just as before he felt compelled to do it for such concealment, because those crimes themselves were punishable with death.

ABSURDITY DETECTED AND ILLUSTRATED.

The truth, then, is this; the improper application of the penalty of death increases crime, but this forms no reason for its abrogation as the penalty for murder. I think I can illustrate the absurdity of the statistical argument by which you would force us to such abrogation, in a striking manner, from the science of medicine. Quinine, in medicine, is a grand remedy for fever; it is a specific, but it needs to be judiciously and skilfully applied. Suppose, now, that a set of quacks should use it injudiciously in the case of fever, and indiscriminately for almost all other diseases, whether of the heart, liver, or lungs, and that in consequence diseases should be multiplied instead of diminished by this medicine. Now gather your statistics of disease in such circumstances, and a strong argument for the abolition of quinine from the medical practice might be made out based upon them. But suppose again that the indiscriminate use of quinine should begin to be diminished, and in consequence it should be shown that diseases had diminished also; and the cause of such diminution being referred to the discontinuance of quinine, suppose you should be told that it is manifest that this remedy ought to be renounced not only in other diseases, but in fevers also. This would be an exact parallel to the statistical argument for the abolition of capital punishment. Would you accept such an argu-

ment? No, you would retain your quinine, but regulate its application. And so, if you are humane and wise, you will retain your salutary ordinance of death as a penalty for murder, but regulate its application. You will not suffer the abuse of a good thing to destroy its use. In almost all reformations this has been the error of mankind. They have not distinguished between uses and abuses. Attacking an evil which was mingled with good, they have swept away the evil indeed, but the good along with it.

RUSSIA, TUSCANY, AND BELGIUM.

You bring forward the case of Russia; but unfortunately for the argument, you bring forward no facts to sustain your statement. It is plainly denied, that for the time you assert there have been no capital punishments inflicted in Russia. It is perfectly well known, that under the reign of the Empress Elizabeth, so far from performing her pledge, many executions occurred; and under her order the dreadful punishment of the knout was inflicted on one of the most accomplished ladies of her court. And as to Catherine, she commenced her own reign with the murder of her husband and nephew, and reserved to herself ever the privilege of putting to death whom she pleased on the accusation of state crimes, and as a matter of state policy. A singular sort of abolition of capital punishment, truly! It is more than 80 years since, with this pretended clemency, Catherine began her reign. I find it distinctly denied that since that period there have been but few executions. Where are your statistical tables

of the sentences passed and executed throughout all the fifty provinces of the vast territory of this despotism? It is said by travelers, that the code of Catherine has been long since disused. And who does not know the terrible punishment of the knout, accompanied sometimes with the cutting out of the tongue, a punishment, which is often death, and which, at a signal of command, can be carried into death at a blow, and is sometimes that administered, so that there is in it all the terror, with more than the cruelty of death, with the pretense and reputation of mildness. Humane constitution of things! Have so many persons died under the infliction of the knout? Oh, this was merely an unfortunate circumstance in administering the punishment; but the code is a very mild one; it abolishes punishment by death!

It does not abolish punishment by death. It simply takes that punishment away from the judges and the courts, through whom the law inflicts it in a free country, and puts it in the exclusive power and keeping of the monarch, to execute when and how he will. It simply makes a more perfect despotism. There is no trial by jury in Russia, and this taking away the power of death from the courts, to keep it solely at the discretion of the king, is only a mode of making him more awful to his subjects, while at the same time he gets the reputation of humanity. You might about as well say that in the despotism of Egypt, capital punishments are abolished, because nobody but Mohammed Ali has the liberty of cutting off men's heads. The argument from this case fails in every point.

Then as to Tuscany. The experiment, it is sufficient to say, proved so unsatisfactory, that the government restored the penalty of death for the restraint of crime, and capital punishment is not now abolished in that kingdom. This is a double proof against you. The government, after trying your experiment, find themselves compelled to return to this statute.

Then as to Belgium. *Capital punishment has not been abolished.* The Code Napoleon is in practice. Murderers are still sentenced to death, and it is only since 1831 that Leopold has commuted the sentence at his own discretion, an experiment so entirely his own temporary fancy, and so little to be relied upon, that at this very time he may be signing a death-warrant for the execution of a criminal. If, since 1831, there had been no executions in New-York, but simply the punishment commuted by the Governor, you might, with the same propriety, assert its abolition here, and institute your statistics accordingly.

Here I am forced by the lateness of the hour to omit some important points. One word seems necessary before closing. So far from deeming it—as some have intimated—an impropriety in a clergyman to appear on this occasion, to appear on any other occasion when the laws of God and the cause of righteousness and benevolence are to be supported, I deem it a part of his proper sphere. It is not his business always to be hedged round with the pulpit, where, as you sometimes say, he has all the argument to himself, and no man can answer him. I, for one, am glad of an opportunity like the present, even though it may possibly

expose us sometimes to taunt, sometimes to undignified invective. With all my heart do I respond to the sentiments of my opponent, as to the right of interpreting and commenting on the Scriptures, by laymen as well as the ministry. It is the very essence of Protestantism; and we may courteously differ in the interpretation and the argument. The truths I have defended are those both of God and man, and they will inevitably prevail, whatever temporary influences there may be against them, for they are founded in God's great attribute of love. In this view, that celebrated stanza of one of our native poets, to which I am sure you will all respond, shall close my argument:

> "Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
> The eternal years of God are hers;—
> While Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
> And dies amidst her worshippers."

ARGUMENT OF THE THIRD EVENING.

Mr. Cheever remarked that the criticism of the statute in Genesis had already been firmly settled, and that he would spend no more time in bandying authorities about it. The arguments which would take away the mandatory force of this statute, would also take away the mandatory force of every statute in the decalogue. My antagonist is greatly mistaken in supposing there is no imperative mood in the Hebrew language; there is an imperative mood, but no third person; and instead of its third person, the future is always used with an imperative sense.

Looking at the context, no other view can possibly be taken of this statute, than as an injunction, a command. The supposition of its being merely a prediction, carries with it another gross absurdity, in addition to those already demonstrated. On this supposition, what becomes of the reason for the statute? God says, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made he man." Now if this be a prediction, it reads thus: Men will kill men for murder, because man was made in the image of God! Really this is giving men credit for a regard to the honor of God, which all that is known of our race denies. If this be a prediction, then it is absolutely false; for men do not punish murder for this

reason, but for other reasons. This is God's reason, but not man's. Besides, inasmuch as, according to your construction, to kill the murderer is to deface God's image in the murderer, if you take it as a prediction it reads thus: "Mankind will destroy God's image in the murderer, because in the image of God made he man." This is a perfect absurdity.

A similar absurd consequence follows your argument that this statute is simply and merely permissive, but not an injunction. It follows, according to your construction, that God gives to any and every man the permission to kill the murderer. But God declares that private revenge is sinful. Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; and yet your argument compels you to the assumption that God here authorizes any and every individual to take into his own hands the avenging the crime of murder in the death of the murderer. Nor is there any way of avoiding this inconsistency but by the interpretation of the statute as belonging not to private individuals, but to the magistracy. And if you say that it is permissive not to individuals, but to governments, then we have, at least, on your own concession, a complete divine sanction for this penalty, if any government deem it expedient. And since not only its expediency but its necessity can be triumphantly proved, we are in entire possession of the argument.

There is a remark of Schlegel in regard to the statutes in the Old Testament, which is of great weight in application to this. He observes that in the writings of Moses, whatever is meant to be a practical law, is

expressed with the greatest accuracy and precision. This is the case with this statute; it stands out from the context with the utmost clearness and precision, as a command. You have pressed the conclusion that if it is binding to put the murderer to death, it is also to put the beast to death who kills a man. I answer, this is no part of the command. But supposing it were. Very well;—take every beast who kills a man, and slay him;—it would do no harm; it would add, if done in the sacred spirit of this precept, incalculable power to the sentiment of the sacredness of human life. But this is not the command. But when God says, At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man; if you ask how he will require it, then instantly follows, the great, broad enactment, Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.

You have said that if this be an injunction, it applies inevitably not merely to what we call murder, but to every case of killing. I notice this evasion [besides the notice taken of it in the last argument] because it is a specimen of the miserable sophistry to which the advocates of the abolition of capital punishment are compelled to resort. It is manifest that God supposes his creatures in possession of common sense. He does not legislate for fools. Your mode of dealing with this passage is just like that monstrous use made of the sixth commandment to bolster up this insupportable argument. Thou shalt not kill; not in any case, you say, not even the murderer. Now just look at this as a specimen of logic. Was Moses utterly destitute of his senses? Could he have dared to give this law as

God's law, meaning that no human life should be taken at any rate, not even that of a murderer, and then in the very same breath to utter also as God's law, the command to put every murderer to death without fail? To this most absurd, most mad conclusion, the argument with which our common sense is insulted forces us. Really, we do not know which to admire most, the ignorance, the hardihood, or the utter disregard of the common sense of mankind, displayed in such a treatment of the Scriptures.

IMPORTANCE OF ADHERING TO THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE ON THIS SUBJECT.

There is also a singular desire on this subject to get rid of the authority of the Scriptures entirely. We have been told that it ought not to be brought into this discussion; that it is too much our habit, as clergymen, to bring it forward on every occasion! Now it is not a good sign to be afraid of the Scriptures, nor is there anything likely to cast more prejudice over the sincerity of your argument against capital punishment, than the manner in which, according to your own acknowledgment, it shuns the light of the Bible. I am sure that the separation between the expediency and theology of this question is an unnatural one. What is true in theology is expedient in practice, and cannot possibly be otherwise. If God appointed this statute for human beings, it is because it is expedient for human beings, it is for the best interests of mankind. All the statistics on this subject, all the comparisons between different modes of punishment, are

before the Divine mind, and always have been, and all the reason that is in them the Supreme Legislator must have known, and acted accordingly. All things considered, it was best that this penalty should be appointed, death as the penalty for murder. For the prevention of crime it was necessary; and I hazard nothing in supposing that had it not been for this penalty among the nations, millions of human beings that have died quietly, would have been sacrificed by the passions of mankind. The expediency of this penalty is therefore in the highest sense an expediency of benevolence; nor could the Divine being have been just to his own attribute of love, had he not annexed this penalty to this crime.

It is great principles of rectitude and benevolence, which must be our guide on such questions as the one before us, and not mere statistics, or temporary experiments; and if those principles are put into laws for us by our Divine Legislator, so much the better. You may reason against appealing to them in this form, and you may sneer at them as fanaticism, as much as you please; but on all great occasions involving practical questions of right and wrong in the community, the general mind will revert to them, and rest upon them. We may bless God for it. If it were not so, if these principles were not elements of our intelligent being, and did not possess a power superior to every consideration, the world to the end of time would be one vast scene of selfishness and cruelty. The principles of mere expediency would always prevail over the principle of right, and men would prey upon each

other like lions and tigers. Let those who make the outcry of fanaticism when benevolent men in moral emergencies attempt to sway the common people by abstract or scriptural principles, remember that it is to the power of those principles, and not to mere considerations of utility or expediency, that they themselves owe their own condition of happiness in human society.

The truth is that the ocean of man's being is swayed to and fro beneath the influence of the sublime eternal verities of Scripture, as the sea is dependent on the influence of heavenly bodies in the majestic regularity of the movement of its tides. Blot out those shining truths, pluck these orbs from the firmament, and you would leave naught but a waste of waters infinite, rolling in endless agitation, without law or object, as in the night and death of chaos. It is impossible that any system of policy can stand, which is not founded in God's word; and this is but saying likewise that no system can stand, which is not founded in the essential elements of man's being. The foundations of perpetuity in states and empires are only in the book of God, and when institutions are not supported there, they are not supported in the constituent elements of human nature. Time will prove their ruin; for as fast as the principles of man's being come out into notice in the light of the word of God, such institutions will be seen not only not based upon them, but in opposition to them. And whether they come into notice or not, they are perpetually working. They heave the ocean, and nothing can abide the contest. It is the Bible, as formed for all time, and containing principles conso-

nant with man's nature as made in the image of his God, and destined to be redeemed into that image, that comprehends and affords the only lasting principles of state policy. That state policy, which is not consonant with the wisdom of the Bible, will be found opposed to the developed wisdom of human society, and to the necessary principles of the human mind. It contains within itself the elements of its own destruction, were it only in its opposition to the nature of the soul.

WISDOM AND GOODNESS OF THE PENALTY OF DEATH FOR MURDER AS THE FOUNDATION OF CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE.

There is a concentration of wisdom and goodness in the statute given to Noah on murder, which we are but poorly able to appreciate. It was a legislation, which, taking the highest crime of which man is capable against his race, as the fit occasion for the concentration of its wisdom and benevolence, was to send its influence over the human character, and over all penal jurisprudence, down through the whole existence of mankind. It was to take the human conscience from its earliest development, and in answer to Cain's murderous question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" it was to answer, "Thou *art* thy brother's keeper; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Thou shalt no more dare to think of taking his life, than thou wouldst of taking thine own. To take his life is in truth to take thine own; for thine shall surely answer for his." It was in fact the very perfection of crimi-

nal jurisprudence, making murder a suicidal act. The man that seeks to loosen the certainty of this statute, loosens a fundamental pillar of society. The statute is fastened deep in the principles of the human mind, and every stroke you aim at it, cuts at the roots of those principles. As it was intended to go through all human existence, so has it gone, so deep, broad, universal, that to give color to your daring experiment, you can find in the history of the race for four thousand years, not one single state, in which, for the period of a single generation, this penalty has been dispensed with. You may be sure this could not have been the case, were not this legislation consonant with and demanded by the elements of the human mind. This statute is a well-spring of truth: it is a shaft sunk into the soul of mankind, that goes clear to the bottom of its sentiments, out of the reach of all mixture of sophistry, deeper than all cross views of a false and mawkish sentimentality, down into the living rock; and thence the stream that gushes up is the pure benevolence of truth as clear as crystal.

TWO THINGS INCONTROVERTIBLE; MEN'S LOVE OF LIFE, AND THEIR FEAR OF DEATH.

To have any ground of plausibility in your argument from expediency for abolishing the penalty of death for murder, you have to deny two things; first, that life is the most sacred and desirable of all possessions; and second, that death is the most terrible of all evils. Now on both these points the sense of mankind is unde-

niable. There may be deranged creatures, who deny both the desirableness of life, and the terribleness of death; just as there are hypochondriacs, who say that their heads are turned round upon their shoulders, so that they can only look behind them; and there may be inveterately hardened creatures, who have so drugged and stupified the moral sensibility with crime, that no consideration whatever will move them; but these exceptions no more weaken the power of the argument, than the fall of a solitary leaf in a great forest can prove the death of the whole foliage. You might as well bring forward one of your monsters of the menageries, your oxen with two heads, or your calves with five legs, to disprove by such a *lusus naturæ* the fact that oxen have but one head, and that calves are quadrupeds. You would be just as wise to take a petrified vegetable from the bottom of a swamp as an example of the qualities of the living vegetable world, as to take the heart of a Newgate criminal, to prove that death is not the greatest of evils.

Now, life being the most sacred of all possessions, it is the natural judgment of mankind that you must guard it by the most terrible of all penalties. But if life be the most precious of all possessions, the human mind again declares that death is the most dreadful of all evils, and therefore consequently the most powerful of all penalties to restrain men from taking life. Until you have disproved these two things, you cannot advance one step in your argument. There is no room for you. You have to root out and destroy these two arguments of the human mind, that life is the most desirable and sacred of all possessions, and that Death is

the King of Terrors. If you can do this, you can change the nature of mankind. But if not, then the conclusion is irresistible on the ground of expediency, that capital punishment is the most efficacious of all penalties to restrain men from the crime of murder, and consequently for the good of society ought to be practised.

It is useless for you to say that capital punishment does not restrain men from minor crimes. The judgment of the human mind is not the same as to the fitness and necessity of the penalty of death for such crimes. Take the case of stealing, for example. You have no prior declaration of the judgment of mankind that a man's property is the most sacred and desirable of all possessions, so that if a portion of it is taken, the greatest of all evils is inflicted; and consequently, the judgment of the mind is against the penalty of death in such a case. It does not assert the congruity of such a penalty with such a crime. But in regard to murder there is such a congruity; the voice of our common humanity asserts it. Taking life, you take all; and life being the most sacred and important of all possessions, the punishment by death, since it is feared more than all things, ought to be the penalty.

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE PENALTY OF DEATH.

Here it is singular to see the contradictory nature of the arguments of our opponents. They speak with two voices. With one voice they say death is too severe, too dreadful, too barbarous: "the gospel and the gallows, Christ and the hangman," it is too shock-

ing to humanity to think of. With the other voice they say it is not severe enough, not sufficiently dreadful; you must have a punishment more to be feared than death, and therefore more barbarous, in order more effectually to restrain crime. If there ever was an argument that stultified itself, this does. If we say death must be the penalty, because men fear death more than all things else, and we wish to restrain the murderer from committing crime; they say, Not at all; men do not fear death enough, this punishment has not enough of terror in it to restrain men. If we say, Death is the just penalty, and is demanded by benevolence, they say, Not at all: there is too much terror in it, it is too dreadful a punishment; we must have a milder one!

There is the same contradictory spirit in the play of their pretended humanity. The advocates for the abolition of the penalty of death for murder are perpetually boasting of their benevolence, and with most profound argument as well as tasteful rhetoric, they ring the changes to the vulgar ears upon such elegant phrases as the "gospel and the gallows, Christ and the hangman." Now to some minds the juxta-position of the words Heaven and Hell gives just as mortal offense, with the idea of the same Being dispensing the rewards of the one, and the punishments of the other; and so does that of the phrases God and a consuming fire. This not being argument I know not very well how to dispose of it. But as to the humanity of this question, so far from the opposition to this statute being the humane side, it is inhuman to the last degree. It is an effort

not only devoid of benevolence, but characterized by great cruelty. It is cruelty to take away from the weak and defenseless that protection which is their only hope against the ferocity of the murderer. I have demonstrated this too clearly to need a word more on the subject.

INHUMANITY TO THE CRIMINAL AND TO SOCIETY OF STRIKING OUT THIS PENALTY.

To strike out this penalty against murder is as inhuman to the criminal as it is to society. This is easily demonstrated. Take the case of that drunkard, who would have murdered his wife, had it not been for this penalty; now in this case, by taking away this penalty, you would at once have occasioned the most enormous of crimes in that wretched man, and the miserable death of that unprotected mother. These two immeasurable evils would have followed your humane legislation. The same thing must take place in multitudes of instances, so that you would at once be creating assassins, and causing the murder of their victims. Therefore humanity to murderers themselves calls on you to restrain them by this penalty in order to keep them from this crime, at the same time that humanity and justice to the innocent call on you to protect them from the passions of the murderer. The penalty is a warning; men see it from afar; it arrests their thoughts, their consciences, before they step within the circle of temptation; or, if hurried unawares, by violent passions, toward this point of danger and of guilt, still does the warning of this tremendous penalty arrest the soul,

and bring the passions of the murderer to a stand even amid the wildest tempest. Now to strike out this penalty, is as inhuman as it would be, on a dangerous rock-bound coast, to destroy the light-house on the sharpest, roughest, most destructive reef across which the tide sweeps and beats its billows. Or I may say it is as if some enemy to mankind should confound the signals, by which the mariners of all countries have hitherto known their nearness to particular points of danger. Or it is as if, giving a chart to a ship bound on a long voyage, you should blot out the black warning scroll, that marks a sunken rock in the Atlantic right in that ship's course. We are all bound on the voyage of life, and the reefs of crime past which we sail are indeed many and terrible. But this is of such appalling magnitude, and the consequences of striking upon it are so dreadful, that there ought, if possible, to be a red light upon it, whose lurid blaze should glare at midnight over the whole ocean. In mercy to mankind God has himself erected such a signal, and you are struggling to tear it down. It is a most inhuman, cruel, anti-scriptural, and irreligious effort.

THIS PENALTY CONFIRMED BY THE LAW OF CHRIST, AND DEMONSTRABLE AS A DUTY SPRINGING FROM THE GREAT LAW OF LOVE.

This pretence of humanity becomes one of unparalleled hypocrisy when it daringly attempts to array the Spirit of Christ in the New Testament against the Spirit of God in the Old. There is not only no contradiction, but a perfect accordance between the New Tes-

tament and the Old on this point. The law of Christ confirms this statute, and I repeat my assertion that it is repromulgated under the form of Love in the gospel. It is demonstrably deducible from the rule "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." How much do you love yourself? So much, that if a murderer were to set upon you to kill you, you would kill him in self-defence. Then you are bound to do the same for your neighbor. If a murderer sets upon your neighbor to kill him, you are bound to defend your neighbor, by putting, if need be, the murderer to death. But the same law of love binds the government to do this, especially when the community have to so great a degree relinquished this business of self-defence, in order that the government may perform it more effectually. Now the same law of benevolence, which ought to make a murderer know that if, while you are standing by, he attacks your neighbor to kill him, you will defend your neighbor by killing, if need be, the murderer, ought to make him feel that the government is exerting the same watchful care, and that if, while the government is standing by, he attempts to kill, or does kill your neighbor, the government also will protect your neighbor as you would, at the expense of the murderer's life. But as the effort of the government is protection and prevention, and not revenge, there is no possibility of this but by making the murderer know before-hand that if he murders, he shall himself die. If in every case of *attempted* murder, the government could itself stand by, and at the moment of peril draw its sword, it would be bound to cut off the murderer

before he kills his victim; but as this is impossible, the next degree of protection must be resorted to, which is preventive, saying to the murderer, If you murder, you die yourself; the whole power of the government will be exerted to put you to death, if you kill another. But to say to the murderer, Thou shalt not surely die, is most inhumanly to give your neighbor up unprotected to the stab of the assassin. It is perfectly plain, therefore, that this statute is repromulgated in the great law of love, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Away then with all this ignorant and mock humanity, that to accomplish its miserable purposes would even, if possible, array the Savior of the New Testament against the God of the Old.

PUBLIC JUSTICE AND PRIVATE REVENGE CONFOUNDED IN THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THIS PENALTY.

I would there were time to dwell for a moment on the ignorant reproaches cast forth on the Jewish law of retaliation, so called, as if it were inhuman, barbarous, vindictive. So far from this being the case, you do yourselves, in fact, proceed on principles far more vindictive. You would not be content by any means to stop at this law of retaliation. For instance, if a man steals your coat, you do not content yourself with taking away a coat from him also, or with making him pay for the coat, but you even put him in the State's prison. And if a man forges a note against you of a hundred dollars, you do not stop at a retaliatory fine of a hundred from him also, but you incarcerate him. This is something more than retaliation. On your

principles, it is atrocious cruelty and barbarism. You confound the distinctions between public justice and private revenge. You make no distinction between the duties of the citizen and the government for the welfare of the community, and the duty of personal forgiveness.

THIS PENALTY NECESSARY TO PRESERVE SOCIETY FROM THE ANARCHY AND VIOLENCE OF PRIVATE REVENGE.

The truth is, there is no alternative between the benevolence of this statute of death to the murderer, and the violence of private revenge. One or the other, society will have, and if they throw off the protection of the one, they must endure the misery of the other. This protecting power must be lodged in the government, with a certainty of its execution, or men must go armed, and we must protect ourselves, and our neighbors too, against the murderer as we can. We may depend upon it that, as a general rule, these men who talk so loudly of the spirit of forgiveness, and quote scripture with so much volubility and delight, Resist not evil, Recompense to no man evil for evil, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord, will be the first to disallow and discredit their own doctrine, if you put them in personal danger; if you insult them when the laws of *dishonor* call for the duel; or if you take the life of a brother or a son. What then becomes of all their beautiful morality? They will avenge themselves, and if the government will not do it, it will be done at a cost of blood and violence

and moral outrage in the community, more dreadful than twenty solemn public executions of the guilty.

There is such a spirit of revenge in the human heart, that you must guard against it. You must take its indulgence from individuals, where it exists as revenge, and commit it to the government to vindicate the law, without malice, without vindictiveness, in the form of justice and protection. When you say to another, Avenge not yourself, you must be prepared to say, The law will do it for you. When you say to another, Protect not your own rights, you must be prepared to say, The government will protect them for you. If you do not, there ensues inevitably a shocking state of society. Let this statute be done away, and you will no more hear these persons who have attempted to set the gospel against it, preaching forgiveness. The maxims which our blessed Lord directs against private malice, they, with most intolerable sophistry, direct against that public, solemn justice of the government, which is God's own avenging interposition, as he has himself declared to us. Do that away, and then see if these men will give you any more of their homilies about not resisting evil, not avenging injuries.

THE EFFORT AGAINST THIS PENALTY A MOCK HUMANITY, BUT A REAL CRUELTY—THIS DEMONSTRATED BY INCONTROVERTIBLE STATISTICS.

It is plain then that this effort is a *mock* humanity, but a *real* and wholesale cruelty. I will show you this by statistics. And to do this, I will enter my adversary's camp, and take his own spoils from him.

I find in the report of the Belgian Minister of Justice to the King, from which I shall presently draw some other statistics that will very much astonish you after the assertions you have heard, that the number of murders in Belgium attempted or consummated from 1831 to 1834, and of which the authors remain unknown, were as follows: 6 poisonings, 60 infanticides, 119 assassinations: making in all 185. Now here are 185 murders in four years, that is, 462 murders in ten years. Now take the ten years to come and look forward. The question is, what is to be done for the security of society? Here are the lives of 462 innocent persons in danger; for, the same causes existing, the same crimes will be enacted these ten years to come as the ten past. The assassins, you know, in some form or other, will attack these innocent persons. What are you bound to do? The least you can do is to threaten them with death, if they execute their purposes. You know that no other penalty, no lesser fear, has any effect upon them. To take away this penalty is in effect to say beforehand, We give up the 462 innocent persons unprotected, and without any effort to save them, to the stab of the assassin. We value the lives of the 462 assassins, more than the lives of their 462 intended victims. The assassins, although they destroy the lives of the 462 innocent persons, shall themselves be protected. I repeat it, this effort is a mock humanity, but a real and wholesale cruelty. This benevolence to murderers, but disregard of their victims, reminds me of the benevolence of that man alluded to with praise by my opponent,

who would go a mile out of the way to avoid treading on a worm, while he was at the very same time thinking of murdering one of his fellow-creatures!

WEAKNESS AND FALSEHOOD OF THE STATISTICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST THIS PENALTY.

I am now going to prove incontrovertibly the falsehood of the statistical argument of my opponent. You are well aware that it is the main foundation on which the advocates for abolishing capital punishment build, and that they have put it forth before us, as if it were impregnable. I shall show that it is not only unsafe, but in its most important particulars absolutely untrue. Statistics by figures in morals are plausible, but if they be not very accurate, they are sure to go against you. In the present case this sort of reasoning is a bridge thrown over a deep and rapid stream, where you are very likely to fall through. It reminds me of those bridges you may sometimes meet in the country, with a notice posted up at the entrance, "Five dollars fine for crossing this bridge faster than on a walk." Just so with this reasoning. If you will take passage in the carriage of the man that built the bridge, and go softly, you may perhaps go safely; but if you attempt to drive a great lumbering wagon of heavy argument across it, you shake it to pieces.

The first thing that strikes the mind in this statistical argument is the almost imperceptibly minute space of time that it covers. The only experiment which has been brought forward with reliable data of any kind, was one of five years! five years' commutation, not

abolition, of the penalty of death, in a European State not one twelfth part so large as the island kingdom of Great Britain! Now it is so ineffably absurd to pretend to draw conclusions for the legislation of the world from such an experiment, that the attempt becomes absolutely ludicrous. Even on the largest scale of territory, you cannot possibly rely on any experiments or statistics, which do not cover a space of time that goes through the whole education of the life of man. Any time less than a period sufficient for the whole formation and development of human character is utterly vain. The effect must be seen on a whole generation. The second thing that strikes the mind in this argument is the utter impossibility of separating and distinguishing between the influence of concurring causes. You can never know how much other changes, events, systems of policy, or ameliorating influences—Sabbath-schools, Bibles, good books, tracts, and the prevalence of temperance—have combined to produce the effect ascribed by you to a single cause.

There may have been twenty causes operating to produce a change in the statistics of crime during a particular period, when an amelioration or change of any kind in the penal code may have had nothing to do with it. To keep the eye in such a case fixed only on this one cause is indeed absurd. You are always in danger of the *post hoc, propter hoc;* just as if an ignorant boor who has all his life got out of his bed before the dawn, should believe and say that his early rising was the cause of the sun's rising!

It is the argument of that old man to Master Sir

Thomas More, of which Latimer gives us so amusing an account, that Tenterden steeple was the cause of Goodwin Sands; for he was a very old man, and he could remember the time when Tenterden steeple was built, but he could not remember to have heard anything said before that time, about the sands in Goodwin harbor; therefore he concluded that Tenterden steeple was the cause of Goodwin Sands. This is the logic of my opponent.

LENGTH OF TIME NECESSARY FOR A PROPER STATISTICAL EXPERIMENT.

I have said that the period of a generation is the least possible period for an experiment; you cannot in any less time, tell either what the human character and interests suffer, or what they gain by such a change. A system of law, you are to remember, is in a great degree the education of the community. Its influence is constant, silent, unnoticed, but mighty. It is a medicine of society, the operation of which, though not sudden, is lasting and powerful. The penalty of death for murder has been for thousands of years exerting a vast influence over the moral sense of mankind. It has acted on the conscience, it has helped the law of love, it has repressed crime, it has been an ingredient in our moral atmosphere, which at every inspiration of our moral being has gone into our circulation. If you take away its influence, you make a change that cannot at present be known fully in its disastrous effect. It is like a deleterious alteration in the combination of the gases that constitute our atmosphere. This penalty

is a tonic to our moral constitution ; the injurious effect of suspending it cannot possibly be seen in less than the growth of a complete generation. On the other hand, the principles on which this statute is founded are eternal and immutable; and when you grapple with principles, you are strong and safe. They are as iron-bolts in the solid rock of the mind ; and unless you fasten your chains of argument to them, you have nothing to hold on by. Everything else is unstable and slippery, as shifting as the sand, and as dangerous to build upon.

STATE OF THE CASE IN RUSSIA—CAPITAL PUNISHMENT NOT ABOLISHED THERE, BUT HELD IN THE POWER OF THE EMPEROR.

One would really have thought from the language of my opponent that all Europe had abandoned the statute of Capital Punishment ; whereas, not one single State or nation can be found, where this is the case. We were pointed to Russia as an example of penal mildness and refinement, that ought to make us blush at our own barbarism. I have already stated some facts in regard to Russia, that totally change the aspect of the statistical argument here. I am informed in addition by a gentleman with whose high reputation we are all familiar, who has traveled extensively in Russia, and was well acquainted with the Emperor, (Rev. Dr. Baird), that murders are very frequent in that country. Of the 400 criminals whom he saw on one occasion about to depart into Siberia, he judges from statistical data, that one-tenth part were murder-

ers. Criminals are sent to Siberia, partly for the purpose of colonizing that portion of the Russian empire. The punishment of the knout is first administered on murderers, sometimes the tongue has been cut off in addition, and if the criminal do not die in consequence of this barbarity, he goes into exile. On every individual who escapes from exile and returns, capital punishment is inflicted. The infliction of death as a legal penalty was taken away, Dr. Baird believes, not from the opinion that it did not prevent crime, or was not the most effectual penalty, but because by irresponsible noblemen and corrupt courts, there being no trial by jury, the power was so shockingly abused, it was taken away from among the legal penalties, and reserved as a power of the throne only. This change it is believed was made because it would not do for the nobles to have the power of life and death over their serfs, with the power of swaying the judges at their pleasure, where there is no trial by jury, and the administration of justice in consequence fearfully corrupt.

Now you can no more reason from such a state of things to our country, than you could reason from Botany Bay to England. And yet this is the country to which we are pointed, forsooth, for an example of mildness and wisdom! A country without the privilege of trial by jury, a country where punishments of the most barbarous description are inflicted, a country which is an absolute despotism, increased in its unlimited power, by the very fact that capital punishment is taken from the legal penalties, and administered by the will of the Emperor! I say it is a slander on our

admirable institutions, and a contempt of our common sense, to point an American to such an example.

BELGIAN STATISTICS IN FAVOR OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

We come now to Belgium. I really know not how to account for the hardihood of our opponents in referring to this case. I hold in my hand a report on the administration of criminal justice in Belgium, during the years 1831, 32, 33, and 34, presented by the Minister of Justice to the King. This is the period referred to by the other side with such daring confidence. If my opponents have not seen this work, I pity them for unconsciously bringing forward statistics in the teeth and eyes of truth; if they have seen it, I shall show the most outrageous misrepresentation. The whole of these statistics bear in favor of capital punishment, and decide with great strength, so far as such a little modicum of evidence can decide anything, against the abrogation or commutation of the penalty of death for murder.

The first classification among these statistics, which bears directly on our argument, distinguishes the crimes against persons, and against property. Under the head of crimes against persons are included, of course, the murders. Now from 1831, the time when the experiment of Leopold's lenity commenced, to 1835, the accusations for crimes against persons were increasing.

In	1831,	they	were	123
"	1832,	"	"	130
"	1833,	"	"	122
"	1834,	"	"	139

The last year of this experiment proved to be the most fruitful in crime. Among the crimes attempted or consummated, of which the authors were not discovered, there were from 1831 to 1834, six poisonings, sixty infanticides, 119 assassinations; in all, 185 murders in four years. "In view of such grave statistics as these," the Minister of Justice remarks, that "it is manifest that the administration of criminal justice does not possess the efficiency necessary for the restraint of crime."

It is important distinctly to remember that the period here spoken of is the very period, in regard to which it has been asserted by our opponents that the statistical results proved a diminution of crime under the abolition of capital punishment. In the first place, there was no such abolition, but only a temporary suspension of the penalty by Leopold. In the next place, under the experiment of this suspension, crimes increased, especially murders. In the third place, the authority of the Belgian Minister of Justice is beyond dispute on this point, and his statistics, and the conclusions by him drawn from them, are perfectly to be relied upon.

Proceeding a little farther in our examination and analysis of these statistics, and comparing the number of crimes of every kind unpunished, there were in 1831, 774; in 1834, 829; showing an increase in these four years. In 1831, the number of crimes in comparison with the population, was one to 6560 inhabitants; in 1834, one to 6476, showing in this way also an increase. The number of murders

in the period from 1826 to 1830, when capital punishment was executed, being compared with that in the period from 1831 to 1834, when it was commuted, gives an increase in the last period in proportion to the number of crimes, 36 being the annual average of murders, in that proportion, from 1826 to 1830, and 42 from 1831 to 1834. The Minister of Justice remarks, that from this table it is manifest that from 1831 to 1834, the number of assassinations and murders has increased compared with the five preceding years. Again, in the year 1829, when capital punishment was executed, only 11 persons were condemned to death; in 1830, only four; in 1831, when capital punishment began to be transmuted, it rose to nine, but in 1834, to 28;—here again an increase under the experiment of lenity. Once more, in 1831 the number of assaults and batteries was 4444; in 1834 it was 6051, showing an increase of 1600 under the experiment of lenity. In 1831 there were before the tribunal of police 21,711 criminals; in 1834, 24,756, showing an increase of more than 3000. During these four years there was a constant increase of crime. In 1831, the tribunal of simple police rendered 7897 judgments; in 1834, 11,762, an increase of 3865.

These Belgian statistics are thus proved to be triumphantly in favor of capital punishment. In view of these statistics, every person must be ready to say with the Minister of Justice, that the administration of criminal jurisprudence in Belgium, manifestly does not possess sufficient energy to restrain from crime. And

what lesson do these statistics teach, as to the consequences of Leopold's experiment of not executing the penalty of death for murder? Surely, so far as any conclusion can be drawn from so limited a period, it must be this, that Leopold's intention, being promulgated, occasioned from the first a relaxation of moral and penal restraint in the vicious community, the consequence of which was a marked increase of crime, especially of murders. In view of these statistics, given under the hand of the Minister of Justice, and certainly to be relied upon, I know not how to denominate the statistics to which we have been treated in the columns of some of the newspapers, and on which our opponents seem unfortunately to have rested, as anything else than a bare falsehood. It is highly probable that the statistics of Belgium for the last five years, exhibit proofs as strongly in favor of capital punishment, as for the four years whose record is before us; that is, if Leopold's lenity has been continued; for the consequence of an assurance that the law, though remaining, will not be executed against murderers, must be a lowering of the moral sense, and an increase of crime. The opinion of the Minister of Justice is strongly marked; had he been going to remonstrate against the king's experiment, he could hardly have said more; he has told king Leopold plainly that thus far during this experiment, crime of the worst kind is on the increase, that it has increased above and compared with the period preceding this experiment, and that His Majesty's criminal records prove that his criminal jurisprudence needs more ener-

gy. Thus the statistical argument from Belgium turns powerfully in favor of capital punishment; and both the statistical and historical argument of my opponent, whether you take the case of Russia, Tuscany, or Belgium, breaks down at every step.

The case of Tuscany has been satisfactorily disposed of, the argument from the experiment there being turned directly against the abolition of capital punishment, since it has been found necessary by experience, probably from the increase of crime, as in Belgium, to return to that punishment. A resident on the spot, in Florence, near the time when the statute establishing capital punishment was repromulgated, gives the following account of the matter:

"The law abolishing capital punishment was promulged under Peter Leopold, grandfather of the reigning Duke. A new code has recently been published, in which capital punishment is threatened in certain cases. Thus Tuscany, whose example has often been quoted by those who would not leave the power of taking life to any tribunal, has gone back to her old position, and taken in her hand again the *sword* of justice, which many years ago she had laid down. The results of her experiment, of course, have not been satisfactory. An American resident of Florence observed that the number of murders in Tuscany in a single year, exceeded that of the murders committed in all the United States in the same period. However that may be, it is a clear case, that this humane government has felt the necesssity of giving to the law which

guards the life of the citizen, a more fearful penalty than that which it has possessed for a long time past."

Thus the attempts to build an historical argument against the penalty of death for murder have all signally failed, as well as the pretences of a statistical argument. They cannot stand the test of truth. Time destroys the historical argument, even the semblance of it; it crumbles before the passing of a single generation; and a correct arithmetic turns the statistical argument on the other side.

POWERFUL HISTORICAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

I shall now adduce to you on my side an historical argument of a very different nature. I shall refer you to the time in which the effects of the penalty of death for murder were tried in the most enlightened and civilized nation in the world for one thousand five hundred years. For more than one thousand five hundred years in the kingdom of Judea the experiment was tried, and the result was, that when the penalty of death for murder was most faithfully executed, the crime of murder was less common; but that in times when that penalty was not executed, or, against the requisitions of the Divine law, was evaded, murders and all other crimes became common; the land was full of blood; and the accusation of cruelty and oppression is brought against the nation, because its princes not only did not execute the law, but even themselves murdered with impunity. Now this is a grand experiment; there is no being de-

ceived in it; it is not a limited induction, but extends over one thousand five hundred years. And here let me remark that the Divine Legislator, under whose administration this experiment was tried, had a perfect knowledge of all objections that could be brought against it; there was the same uncertainty even in the best conducted legal investigations; the same difficulty of bringing the warped consciences of men up to the standard of the law; the same false philanthropy for the murderer, and unwillingness of jurors to convict; the same danger lest the innocent should be punished instead of the guilty; the same objection of dismissing a man into eternity unprepared for death; but in view of all these things the penalty of death for murder was affixed to the law, and the experiment was continued for more than one thousand five hundred years in the nation under God's particular care, while in regard to all other nations there stood unrepealed, the old Noachic ordinance, Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. Now I think this experiment may safely be put against any ten years in Belgium, or twenty in Tuscany, or eighty or one hundred under the wisdom of a murderer and adulteress, in the despotism of Russia.

A FINAL OBJECTION ANSWERED.

There remains to be answered one objection. It is that of the danger of dismissing a man from probation in his sins. "By what authority," it is asked, "do we limit the space of a man for repentance?" The ob-

jection has, of course, no weight with those who found the duty to take the life of the criminal on the Divine injunction, because, it is the Divine Being, who, in the penalty itself, limits his space for repentance, just as he does that of every man, in his providence, by death. But I answer, first, my opponent has conceded the right of society, in certain cases, to take life, the right of a man in self-defence, and of society also. But is not this the limiting a man's space for repentance? Is not this to run the hazard of cutting a man off in his sins? Now if a man may do this suddenly in self-defence, much more may society do it deliberately, for the defence of society, allowing even the criminal abundant time for repentance. But we contend that a murderer, condemned to death, with several weeks intervening between the sentence and the execution, is incomparably more likely to repent than if you imprisoned him for life. Indeed, it is the declaration of God himself, that because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil. I suppose that we all, if we knew that sentence of death was issued against us, and would infallibly be executed within a few weeks, the time being fixed, should address ourselves much more diligently and effectually to the work of repentance, than if we had an indefinite respite. And the sentence might be the very means of our repentance, while the respite might be the very means of our never repenting. Why then should it not be so with the criminal? In this view, punishment by death is infinitely more humane to the spiritual interests of the

murderer, than imprisonment for life. By imprisoning him for life, you may cause his eternal death; by sentencing him to death, you may cause his eternal salvation.

But this objection, to many minds, is met more powerfully by throwing it back npon the abolition of this penalty. It is those, who aim at abolishing this penalty, who would cause men to be sent into eternity unprepared. In the abolition of this penalty, the number of murders would inevitably be increased, and every individual so murdered is sent into eternity, not with the weeks of preparation, and all the solemn holy inducements and appliances allotted to the murderer, but in a moment, without a breath for prayer, without time so much as to say, God be merciful to me a sinner. Now I say, without hesitation, it is worse to send one person into eternity in this manner, than it would be to send ten murderers with six weeks' warning. But if you were to repeal this penalty of death for murder, then by the increase of this crime, for every murderer now with solemn warning executed, you would probably be the occasion of sending two or three innocent persons unwarned and unprepared into eternity. This is an inevitable result on the repeal of this penalty. I say, therefore, that its abolition would be an act of impiety; for the substitution of imprisonment for life would probably make most murderers die in their sins, while it would send many innocent persons unprepared into eternity. I turn this objection, therefore, back with tenfold power upon your own proposed repeal of the penalty of death for murder. It constitutes in the mind

of every benevolent person one of the very strongest arguments against such a repeal.

FINAL ATTEMPT TO EVADE THE STATUTE.—ABSURDITY OF THE EVASION DEMONSTRATED.

Before concluding my argument I must return for one moment to the great statute of Jehovah with which we set out, in order to expose the fallacy of the latest mode adopted by my opponent for evading the binding force of this statute. He proposes to render the ordinance, *among men*, instead of *by man* shall his blood be shed. Now, in the first place, this would not help the matter at all, since it may be powerfully argued, if you take this as the translation, that it manifestly refers to the solemn process, by which this statute shall be executed, not carelessly, or by single avengers, or without the consent of mankind, but by the judgment of men, by witnesses and judges, as afterwards more definitely these specifications were in fact added, serving as a signal commentary on the statute itself. So that, even if you render it *among men*, you gain nothing but this, that in all probability the magistracy itself is referred to, and the court of justice signified, as the way in which the penalty shall be affirmed, the sentence of the murderer issued. This would be the meaning if you render it *among men*, or else it must mean simply *in the presence of men*, which is the sense Vatablus says those persons wish, who interpret it *among men*; "*Inter homines*, that is, *publice, et in conspectu omnium, cunctisque viventibus*," *among men*, that is, *publicly, and in the sight of all persons*

looking on. This would not in the least degree diminish the force of this statute as an injunction. It is impossible that by this rendering you can convert the death of the murderer into an accident, that may or may not take place among men, for the *reason* why it shall always take place *is given.* And besides, if the murderer is put to death *among* men, it must still be *by* men that his execution is accomplished. It is not a flash of lightning that is to fall upon him, nor a death by drowning, nor any sudden and fatal pestilence provided for the murderer, but a death among men *by men*, by witnesses and judges. Every attempt to break violently through the hedge of this statute, only entangles the opponents of it more helplessly among its thorns.

My opponent has asserted, with astonishing hardihood, that the Septuagint translation is in favor of this rendering. So far is this from being true, that this rendering cannot be found in the Septuagint translation at all, which omits the phrase *by man* altogether, and simply says, " The person shedding the blood of man, for the blood of that man his blood shall be shed;" giving the statute the same universal form of injunction, which it has in the Hebrew. The Septuagint translation is as follows: Ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρωπος, ἀντὶ του αἱματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται. The phrase *by man* is omitted, and it is simply ἀντὶ του, &c., which cannot possibly be rendered except by the phrase *for, instead of;* and if the words το αὐτοῦ are added, as Le Clerc has suggested from the Complutensian manuscript, the sentence must be rendered thus: *the person shedding man's blood, instead of his blood that was shed, that of*

the murderer shall be shed. This Septuagint translation therefore powerfully supports the interpretation of the ordinance as an injunction. It is not a prediction that in the course of Divine Providence, the murderer will die, but it is a statute, that *instead of* the person murdered, the murderer's blood shall be shed, that is, deliberately, designedly and speedily. Le Clerc himself interprets it, *pro sanguine hominis, ejus sanguis effundetur ; for the blood of man, his blood shall be shed.*

My opponent has also gone so far as to assert, that Calvin's opinion was against the common interpretation of this passage. Now, so far is this from being the case, that Calvin distinctly says that in this statute *God arms the magistracy with the sword for the punishment of murderers.* Calvin renders the phrase which in our common translation is rendered *by man*, *in homine*, *in man*, and he does this simply because he thinks this phrase was used *to mark more expressly the atrocity of the guilt of murder.* He says that he does not deny that the punishment of murder with death, by the judges, is here meant, but that *more* is meant. God prepares other providential executioners of his law, at the same time that he arms the magistracy with the sword, in order that the blood of man may not be shed with impunity. The opinion of Calvin, in his commentary, is so clearly and so strongly in favor of this statute as an injunction, that I cannot account for the manner in which my opponent has hazarded his credit, in appealing to this distinguished writer.

The direct and natural translation of the passage is *by man*, and not *among men ;* so did the Jewish Tar-

gum of Onkelos render it; so did the Rabbins; so, before all, did Josephus; and they applied it to the magistracy; and Le Clerc, to whom my opponent refers, observes that the Hebrew preposition here used may everywhere (passim) signify *per*, *by*, or *through*; though, as in some peculiarities of Hebrew construction the sense of *inter*, or *among*, may be admitted, he prefers that sense in this place. But according to Le Clerc's own remark on the preposition, the most natural translation is *by man* and not *among men*; as it is also, *whosoever* and not *whatsoever*; and with these two poor attempts at critical ingenuity, the power of torturing upon this passage is exhausted. After you have stretched it on the rack, its meaning is still the same, and you cannot succeed in altering it.

The climax of absurdity to which the proposed rendering would reduce the whole statute, as a mere prediction, is so great that it is surprising it should find a single advocate. The Divine Being has just been uttering the solemn declaration that at the *hands of men* he would require the blood of man. Now if the question be asked, *How* will he require it? *how* will this threat be fulfilled? this proposed interpretation gravely replies, Whoso sheddeth man's blood, that man—WILL DIE AMONG MEN! Wonderful conclusion, most wonderful! The murderer will, in God's providence, die; and not only so, but *among men* he will die! And this is the way in which God will require the blood of the murderer *at the hands of men!* And not only so, but the murderer will thus die *among men*, because *in the image of God made he man!*

In fact, neglecting the context, and atempting to change the common and natural translation of this statute, so as to make it other than a command, you fall into such absurdities, that it is only necessary to state them, in order to strengthen tenfold the assurance of every reader of the Bible in the faithfulness and accuracy of the translation as it stands.

THE REASON GIVEN FOR THE PENALTY MAKES IT ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN THAT THIS ORDINANCE IS AN INJUNCTION.

In fact, the reason given for the penalty, stands directly in the way of every possible interpretation of this ordinance, save only that which is on the face of it, as a command. It is not an accident, nor an ordinary occurrence in the Divine Providence, whereby the blood of the murderer shall be shed, but a particular and perpetual determination of Jehovah, *for this reason*, that IN THE IMAGE OF GOD MADE HE MAN; and *therefore*, he that defaces and destroys that image by murder, shall solemnly be put to death. This putting to death must be among men, or not at all; it is not among beasts, nor among angels; and this ordinance is itself the grand means of accomplishing this result; for without this ordinance murderers would no more be put to death than other criminals. Put, if you please, in any community, in the place of this ordinance, the mere prediction you contend for, and post at the head of your criminal jurisprudence just this; MEN THAT MURDER WILL CERTAINLY DIE; and then see

if on this account murderers die any more frequently or violently than other men. Indeed, your mode of expounding this passage reduces it almost to a laughable absurdity. The wonder is that you have not gone one step farther in your critical sagacity, so as to interpret the declaration by man *shall his blood be shed*, as signifying simply that a vein shall be carefully punctured in the arm of the murderer, and a number of ounces of blood taken, and then imprisonment for life administered as the sentence. This amendment would be no more ridiculous than the other expedients, by which you seek to rid yourselves of what you candidly acknowledge to be a terrible *incubus* on your argument.

CONCLUSION.

THE RIGHT MODE OF DIRECTING PUBLIC OPINION.

The statistical argument is what my opponent has mainly relied upon, but it has proved to him unfaithful. On the great moral and scriptural principles connected with this subject, the adversaries of the punishment of death for murder are unwilling to dwell. And this, most certainly, is a mark against their cause. But if they, or any community, are averse from the discussion of such a question upon such principles, so much the greater necessity of explaining and defending those principles. If public opinion is wrong, it is only thus that you can set it right. And if the public mind be greatly excited, you can gain nothing in any time of commotion on a great question, by withdrawing, or at-

tempting to withdraw out of view the great principles around which all the agitation gathers. That agitation will continue, the elements will forever be disturbed, till those great principles find their proper place, and rule in all minds. Push them forth then into notice; make them more and more prominent; and then when once rooted and grounded, you will have a stable foundation for good order to rest upon. Till then you will have uncertainty, revolution, private revenge, and the horrible despotism of the passions of the multitude. It is a great mistake when you shun the encounter of a prejudice, or seek to allay a commotion, by shutting up a truth. There may be ignorance and prejudice in juries, there may be a mistaken or a depraved public opinion in communities. But to give up great principles on such occasions, or for such reasons, is just taking away the foundations that you may save the superstructure. It is nothing but the establishment and reverence of such principles that can preserve aught that is blessed in Church or State. And it is the very madnesss of mock-prudence, through fear of the prejudices or passions of the multitude to shuffle out of view those sublime and awful truths, beneath whose powerful sway only it is that righteous law can be supported, and the passions of the multitude hushed to repose.

The protrusion of a great principle may arrest and excite all minds, and set the world in an uproar, but it will prevail for good. It is like throwing a vast mountain of granite into the sea. For a time you raise the whole ocean in fury; but wait awhile, and

you see the waves that rolled in rival mountains, retreating from its rugged sides, and worshiping around it; and on its lofty summit you may fix a light-house for the world. The great principle given by Jehovah to Noah in this statute, and to the world through him, is such a lofty mountain, sustaining on its summit a light of life and legislation for all succeeding generations; and sure we are that the puny efforts directed from time to time against it will prove but as the foam and agitation of the idly raving billows in the ocean.

BOOK MU
RETURNE
NO 9 '5